BIBCO Participants' Manual

Draft Outline of Component Parts: Progress to Date

03/18/02

(THIS MANUAL IS BEING ADDED TO AND REVISED CONTINUALLY. PLEASE SEND COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS TO CAROL HIXSON AT chixson@oregon.uoregon.edu

Title page

Acknowledgements

A. BIBCO Program: Background and Organization

B. Policies and Practices

- ❍ [Ex. 2](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 3](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 4](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 5](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 6](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 7](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 8](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 9](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 10](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 11](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 12](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 13](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 14](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 15](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 16](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 17](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 18](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 19](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 20](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 21](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 22](#)
- ❍ [Ex. 23](#)
- ❍ [OCLC-Specific Examples (record upgrades)](#)

draft

BIBCO
PARTICIPANTS'
MANUAL

edited by
Carol Hixson
University of Oregon Library
Ana Cristan
Library of Congress

Contributions by
PCC Standing Committee on Training
BIBCO Operations Committee
and
PCC Members at Large

A1   Overview

This manual is intended as an overview of BIBCO policies and practices and a guide to creating high quality monographic records. It is not intended to replace other essential documentation, such as AACR, MARC 21, PCC Core standards, *LC Rule Interpretations*, classification schedules, subject lists and thesauri, and bibliographic utility input standards. Although information from all these sources is included throughout, this manual frequently refers the user to the more detailed information to be found in the source documents, expecting that BIBCO catalogers will consult them as necessary and keep up with changes to them. Examples provided were taken from real life and were accurate and conformed to standards at the time of completion. The emphasis in the examples is on illustrating principles and options, rather than providing a detailed roadmap of practice.

A1.1   Synopsis

BIBCO is an international cooperative program for online cataloging and is the monographic bibliographic record component of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC). Participants create cataloging records using mutually agreed upon standards and contribute them to one of the international bibliographic databases (such as OCLC or RLIN). BIBCO members are responsible for contributing records that meet at least PCC Core standards, i.e., records that are of a sufficiently high quality that another library could utilize them with little or no review or local modification. Participating libraries may choose to include more than the PCC Core standards require. BIBCO records are readily identified as PCC records and are notable for having:
- all access points supported by internationally available authority records (the three exceptions are noted in Section B1.4);
- a classification number from an internationally recognized scheme, such as Library of Congress, Dewey, or National Library of Medicine classification (the exceptions are those formats where classification number is optional, as articulated in PCC Core standards); and,
- subject analysis, at the appropriate level of specificity, drawn from one of the internationally recognized thesauri such as LCSH, MeSH, etc.

Membership in the BIBCO Program currently includes the national libraries of the United States and public, academic, and research libraries. All independent NACO members of the PCC are invited to join BIBCO.

BIBCO catalogers receive instruction from formally trained, practicing catalogers from PCC member institutions. Because catalogers must first be independent NACO contributors for names and, in the case of OCLC, must also have National Enhance authorization, it is assumed during training that the catalogers already know the tools of the trade and are already producing high quality cataloging. Emphasis is placed on developing judgment and decision-making skills and using internationally accepted standards and tools intelligently. High quality cataloging is defined in terms of timeliness, as well as usability, both to other catalogers and to end users. After BIBCO training, cataloging output is reviewed for a period of time by an experienced BIBCO cataloger, usually from another institution. Once an institution's catalogers are off review, there is no formal Program review process of their records. Other libraries act as an informal, continuous review

panel and are encouraged to contact an institution's BIBCO liaison if there is a problem with a Program record. The list of BIBCO liaisons is posted on the PCC Web site at: (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc)

A1.2. Missions, Goals, Objectives

The primary mission of BIBCO is to increase the timely availability of high quality cataloging records. One goal in support of this mission is to increase the number of libraries that are participating in the Program and contributing to the pool of records. A key objective for increasing participation is flexibility within a foundation of shared standards. By embracing a variety of recognized classification and subject heading standards, and encouraging contributions from varied libraries around the world via the major bibliographic utilities, the Program hopes to make it both cost-effective and attractive for libraries to participate and seeks to increase the utility of the records worldwide. A fundamental feature of this flexibility is that the records are dynamic -- the institution which creates the original record may choose to exceed the PCC Core standards, and other authorized PCC institutions may choose to enrich existing PCC records by adding additional access points, adding subject headings or classification numbers from a different scheme, or adding or expanding notes. The focus of such enrichment is not to attempt to create the fullest possible record but rather to add those notes or access points that the enriching library needs to provide the appropriate access within its collection.

Since BIBCO is a component of the PCC, details relating to its mission, goals, and objectives can be found in the PCC Strategic Plan (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/stratplan.html) and other documents available on the BIBCO Web site (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco.html). Participants are referred to those sites for the most up-to-date policies and strategic plans.

A1.3 Chart of BIBCO Members

(see: http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibcoliaisons.html)

A1   Overview

This manual is intended as an overview of BIBCO policies and practices and a guide to creating high quality monographic records. It is not intended to replace other essential documentation, such as AACR, MARC 21, PCC Core standards, *LC Rule Interpretations*, classification schedules, subject lists and thesauri, and bibliographic utility input standards. Although information from all these sources is included throughout, this manual frequently refers the user to the more detailed information to be found in the source documents, expecting that BIBCO catalogers will consult them as necessary and keep up with changes to them. Examples provided were taken from real life and were accurate and conformed to standards at the time of completion. The emphasis in the examples is on illustrating principles and options, rather than providing a detailed roadmap of practice.

A1.1   Synopsis

BIBCO is an international cooperative program for online cataloging and is the monographic bibliographic record component of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC). Participants create cataloging records using mutually agreed upon standards and contribute them to one of the international bibliographic databases (such as OCLC or RLIN). BIBCO members are responsible for contributing records that meet at least PCC Core standards, i.e., records that are of a sufficiently high quality that another library could utilize them with little or no review or local modification. Participating libraries may choose to include more than the PCC Core standards require. BIBCO records are readily identified as PCC records and are notable for having:

- all access points supported by internationally available authority records (the three exceptions are noted in Section B1.4);
- a classification number from an internationally recognized scheme, such as Library of Congress, Dewey, or National Library of Medicine classification (the exceptions are those formats where classification number is optional, as articulated in PCC Core standards); and,
- subject analysis, when the nature of the work requires it, at the appropriate level of specificity, using one of the internationally recognized thesauri such as LCSH, MeSH, etc.

Membership in the BIBCO Program currently includes the national libraries of the United States and public, academic, and research libraries. All independent NACO members of the PCC are invited to join BIBCO.

BIBCO catalogers receive instruction from formally trained, practicing catalogers from PCC member institutions. Because catalogers must first be independent NACO contributors for names and, in the case of OCLC, must also have National Enhance authorization, it is assumed during training that the catalogers already know the tools of the trade and are already producing high quality cataloging. Emphasis is placed on developing judgment and decision-making skills and using internationally accepted standards and tools intelligently. High quality cataloging is defined in terms of timeliness, as well as usability, both to other catalogers and to end users. After BIBCO training, cataloging output is reviewed for a period of time by an experienced BIBCO cataloger, usually from another institution. Once an institution's catalogers are off review, there is no formal Program review process of their records. Other libraries act as an informal, continuous review

panel and are encouraged to contact an institution's BIBCO liaison if there is a problem with a Program record. The list of BIBCO liaisons is posted on the PCC Web site at: (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc)

A1.2. Missions, Goals, Objectives

The primary mission of BIBCO is to increase the timely availability of high quality cataloging records. One goal in support of this mission is to increase the number of libraries that are participating in the Program and contributing to the pool of records. A key objective for increasing participation is flexibility within a foundation of shared standards. By embracing a variety of recognized classification and subject heading standards, and encouraging contributions from varied libraries around the world via the major bibliographic utilities, the Program hopes to make it both cost-effective and attractive for libraries to participate and seeks to increase the utility of the records worldwide. A fundamental feature of this flexibility is that the records are dynamic -- the institution which creates the original record may choose to exceed the PCC Core standards, and other authorized PCC institutions may choose to enrich existing PCC records by adding additional access points, adding subject headings or classification numbers from a different scheme, or adding or expanding notes. The focus of such enrichment is not to attempt to create the fullest possible record but rather to add those notes or access points that the enriching library needs to provide the appropriate access within its collection.

Since BIBCO is a component of the PCC, details relating to its mission, goals, and objectives can be found in the PCC Strategic Plan (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/stratplan.html) and other documents available on the BIBCO Web site (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco.html). Participants are referred to those sites for the most up-to-date policies and strategic plans.

A1.3 Chart of BIBCO Members

(see: http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibcoliaisons.html)

List of BIBCO Members and Liaisons

Go to institution names beginning: C E H-I J-L M-N O-P Q-T U V-Z

Go to: **BIBCO Operations Committee members**

Arizona State University MARC 21 code: AzTeS utility: OCLC (code=AZS) local system: Innovative Interfaces contact: Ronda Ridenour phone: 480.965.9803 fax: 480.965.1043 e-mail: ronda.ridenour@asu.edu	**Brigham Young University** MARC 21 code: UPB utility: RLIN (code=UTBG) local system: SIRSI Unicorn contact: John B. Wright phone: 801.378-5246 fax: 801.378.6708 email: john_wright@byu.edu	**Brooklyn Law School Library** MARC 21 code: NBL utility: OCLC (code=ZBL) local system: Innovative Interfaces contact: Maria Okonska phone: 718.780.7977 fax: 718.780.0369 email: mokonska@brooklaw.edu
Center for Research Libraries MARC 21 code: ICRL utility: OCLC (code=CRL) local system: Innovative Interfaces contact: Serafima Dukhan phone: 800.621.6044 fax: 312.955.4339 email: dukhan@crlmail.uchicago.edu	**Cleveland Public Library** MARC 21 code: OCl utility: OCLC (code=CLE) local system: Data Research Associates contact: Margaret Shen phone: 216.623-2886 fax: 216.623.6980 email: Margaret.Shen@cpl.org	**Columbia University** MARC 21 code: NNC utility: RLIN (code=NYCG)/OCLC (code=ZCU) local system: NOTIS contact: Kate Harcourt phone: 212.854.2714 fax: 212.854.5167 email: harcourt@columbia.edu
Cornell University MARC 21 code: NIC utility: RLIN (code=NYCX)/OCLC (code=COO) local system: Endeavor contact: Martin Kurth phone: 607.255.6112 fax: 607.255.6110 email: mk168@cornell.edu	**Duke University** MARC 21 code: NcD utility: OCLC (code=NDD) local system: DRA contact: Amy Turner phone: 919.684.5901 fax: 919.684.2978 email: amy.turner@duke.edu	**Eastman School of Music Sibley Music Library** MARC 21 code: NRU-Mus utility: OCLC (code=RES) local system: Endeavor contact: Jennifer Bowen voice: 716.274.1370 fax: 716.274.1380 email: jbsm@uhura.cc.rochester.edu

Harvard University

MARC 21 code: MH
utility: OCLC (code=HUL)
local system: Ex-Libris
contact: Bruce Trumble
phone: 617.496.3795
fax: 617.495.0403
email: trumble@fas.harvard.edu

IU School of Law-Indianapolis

MARC 21 code: InIU-L
utility: OCLC (code=ILI)
local system: SIRSI Unicorn
contact: Chris Evin Long
phone: 317.274.1924
fax: 317.274.8825
email: clong@iupui.edu

Indiana University

MARC 21 code: InU
utility: OCLC (code=IUL)
local system: SIRSI Unicorn
contact: Mechael Charbonneau
phone: 812.855.5674
fax: 812.855.7933
email: mgago@indiana.edu

Joint Forces Staff College

MARC 21 code: ViNSC
utility: OCLC (code=AFQ)
local system: Horizon
contact: Robert O. Ellett, Jr.
phone: (757) 443-6405
fax: (757) 443-6044
email: ellettr@jfsc.ndu.edu

National Agricultural Library

MARC 21 code: DNAL
utility: OCLC (code=AGL)
local system: VTLS
contact: Michael Esman
phone: 301.504.7565
fax: 301.504.5471
email: mesman@usda.gov

National Library of Medicine

MARC 21 code: DNLM
utility: OCLC (code=NLM)
local system: Endeavor
contact: Alice Jacobs
phone: 301.496.7136
fax: 301.402.1211
email: jacobsa@mail.nlm.nih.gov

New York Public Library

MARC 21 code: NN
utility: OCLC (code=NYP)
local system: Innovative Interfaces
contact: Marcel Lipkowitz
phone: 212.642.0117
fax: 212.930.0785
email: mlipkowitz@nypl.org

New York University

MARC 21 code: NNU
utility: RLIN (code=NYUG)
local system: GEAC
contact: Sherman Clarke
phone: 212.998.2462
fax: 212.995.4366
email: sherman.clarke@nyu.edu

New York University Law School Library

MARC 21 code: NNU-L
utility: RLIN (code=NYUL)
local system: Innovative Interfaces
contact: George Prager
phone: 212.998.6340
fax: 212.998.6587
email: pragerg@juris.law.nyu.edu

Northwestern University

MARC 21 code: IEN
utility: OCLC (code=INU)
contact: Andrea Stamm
local system: Endeavor
phone: 847.491.7587
fax: 847.491.8306
email: astamm@nwu.edu

Oberlin College

MARC 21 code: OO
utility: OCLC (code=OBE)
local system: Innovative Interfaces
contact: John Sluk
phone: 440.775.8285 ext. 228
fax: 440.775.8739
email: john.m.sluk@oberlin.edu

Oklahoma State University

MARC 21 code: OkS
utility: OCLC (code=OKS)
local system: Endeavor
contact: Co-ming Chan
phone: 405.744.9758
fax: 405.744.5183
email: cmchan@okstate.edu

Princeton University

MARC 21 code: NjP
utility: RLIN (code=NJPG)
local system: Endeavor
contact: Joyce Bell
phone: 609.258.5681
fax: 609.258.0441
email: joyceb@princeton.edu

Queens Borough Public Library

MARC 21 code: NJQ
utility: OCLC (code=ZQP)
local system: Data Research
Associates contact: Elizabeth
Ankersen
phone: 718.990.0730
fax: 718.291.8936
email: eankersen@queenslibrary.org

Saint Louis University, Law Library

MARC 21 code: MoSU-L
utility: OCLC/LC (code=SLU)
local system: Innovative Interfaces
contact: Richard Amelung
phone: 314.977.2743
fax: 314.977.3966
email: amelunrc@slu.edu

Smithsonian Institution Libraries

MARC 21 code: DSI
utility: OCLC (code=SMI)
local system: Horizon
contact: Lowell Ashley
phone: 202.357.3161
fax: 202.357.4532
email: ashleyl@sl.si.edu

Stanford University

MARC 21 code: CSt
utility: RLIN (code=CSUG)/OCLC
(code=STF)
local system: SIRSI Unicorn
contact: Mia Rode
phone: 650.725.1113
fax: 650.725.1120
email: mrode@sulmail.stanford.edu

State University of New York at Buffalo

MARC 21 code: NBuU
utility: OCLC (code=BUF)
local system: NOTIS
contact: Judith Hopkins
phone: 716.645.2796
fax: 716.645.5955
email: ulcjh@acsu.buffalo.edu

Texas AM University

MARC 21 code: TxCM
utility: OCLC (code=TXA)
local system: NOTIS
contact: Mary Dabney Wilson
phone: 409.845.1342
fax: 409.862.1166
email: mdw@tamu.edu

Tulane University

MARC 21 code: LNT
utility: OCLC (code=LRU)
local system: Endeavor
contact: Rebecca Malek-Wiley
phone: 504.865.5696
fax: 504.862.8556 or 865.6773
email: malek@tulane.edu

United States Government Printing Office

MARC 21 code: DGPO
utility: OCLC
local system: OCLC
contact: Steve Uthoff
phone: 202.512.1106
fax: 202.512-1432
email: suthoff@gpo.gov

University of California, Berkeley

MARC 21 code: CU
utility: OCLC (code=CUY)
local system: GLADIS/Innovative
Interfaces
contact: Armanda Barone
phone: 510.643.8239
fax: 510.642.8331
email: abarone@library.berkeley.edu

University of California, Los Angeles

MARC 21 code: CLU
utility: OCLC (code=CLU)
local system: DRA
contact: Caroline R. Miller
phone: 310.825.4446
fax: 310.206.4974
email: crmiller@library.ucla.edu

University of Chicago

MARC 21 code: ICU
utility: OCLC (code=CGU)
local system: Horizon
contact: Patricia Williams
phone: 773.702.3215
fax: 773.702.6623
email: paw7@midway.uchicago.edu

University of Colorado at Boulder MARC 21 code: CoU utility: OCLC (code=COD) local system: Innovative Interfaces contact: William Garrison phone: 303.492.3920 fax: 303.492.0494 email: william.garrison@colorado.edu	**University of Dayton** MARC 21 code: ODaU utility: OCLC (code=DAY) local system: Innovative Interfaces contact: Susan Tsui phone: 937.229.4268 fax: 937.229.4590 email: tsui@udayton.edu	**University of Florida** MARC 21 code: FU utility: OCLC (code=FUG) local system: NOTIS contact: Jimmie Lundgren phone: 352.392.0351 fax: 352.392.4788 email: jimlund@mail.uflib.ufl.edu
University of Maryland Libraries MARC 21 code: MdU utility: OCLC (code=UMC) local system: CARL (moving to Ex-Libris) contact: John Schalow phone: 301.405.9320 fax: 301.314.9971 email: js368@umail.umd.edu	**University of New Mexico** MARC 21 code: NmU utility: OCLC (code=IQU) local system: Innovative Interfaces contact: Chris Mueller phone: 505.277.8391 fax: 505.277.6019 email: cmueller@unm.edu	**University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill** MARC 21 code: NcU utility: OCLC (code=NOC) local system: Data Research Assoc. contact: Margaretta Yarborough phone: 919.962.9693 fax: 919.962.4450 email: mjy@unc.edu
University of Oregon MARC 21 code: OrU utility: OCLC (code=ORU) local system: Innovative Interfaces contact: Carol Hixson voice: 541.346.3064 fax: 541.346.3485 email: chixson@oregon.uoregon.edu	**University of Pennsylvania** MARC 21 code: PU utility: RLIN (code=PAUG) local system: Endeavor contact: Jean Craig phone: 215.898.0315 fax: email: craigje@pobox.upenn.edu	**University of Texas at Austin** MARC 21 code: TxU utility: OCLC (code=IXA) local system: UTCAT contact: Robin Fradenburgh phone: 512.495.4159 fax: 512.495.4410 email: r.fradenburgh@mail.utexas.edu
University of Washington MARC 21 code: WaU utility: OCLC (code=WAU) local system: Innovative Interfaces contact: Adam L. Schiff phone: 206.543.8409 fax: 206.685.8782 email: aschiff@u.washington.edu	**University of Wisconsin-Madison** MARC 21 code: WU utility: OCLC (code=WZX) local system: Endeavor contact: Clarence Brown phone: 608.262.3420 fax: 608.265.2754 email: cbrown@library.wisc.edu	**Vanderbilt University** MARC 21 code: TNJ utility: OCLC (code=TJC) local system: SIRSI Unicorn contact: Mary Charles Lasater phone: 615.343.2085 fax: 615.343.1295 email: lasater@library.vanderbilt.edu

Yale University

MARC 21 code: CtY
utility: RLIN (code=CTYG)/OCLC (code=YUS)
local system: NOTIS (moving to Endeavor July 2002)
contact: Robert Killheffer
phone: 203.432.8252
fax: 203.432.7231
email: robert.killheffer@yale.edu

Return to top of page

go to:
Program for Cooperative Cataloging Home Page
Library of Congress Home Page

Library of Congress
Library of Congress Help Desk (03/26/02)

A2.   Background

A2.1 History of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging

The Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) is an international cooperative effort aimed at expanding access to library collections by providing useful, timely, and cost-effective cataloging which meets mutually accepted standards of libraries around the world. PCC records are intended to be rich enough in content for inclusion in local catalogs without review by high level staff and reasonable enough in cost to be generated in large numbers.

The PCC was initiated in February 1995 -- a product of deliberations of the Cooperative Cataloging Council (CCC), which began its work in April 1993. The CCC itself was conceived at a meeting of various participants in cooperative library programs that was held at the Library of Congress in November 1992. The CCC envisioned a program that by the year 2000 would annually produce significant numbers of authority and bibliographic records created by an ever-increasing membership of program participants. In November 1996, the CONSER Policy Committee and the PCC Executive Council met to discuss the merging of the two cooperative cataloging programs. The consolidation became effective in October 1997. Today, PCC has four components:

NACO-- Name Authority Cooperative Program (including name and series authority records)
SACO-- Subject Authority Cooperative Program
BIBCO-- Bibliographic Record Cooperative Program (monographic)
CONSER-- Cooperative Online Serials Program

The goals of the PCC are to:

1. Cooperatively enhance the timely availability of bibliographic and authority records by cataloging more items, producing cataloging that is widely available for sharing and use by others, and performing cataloging in a more cost-effective manner.
2. Develop and maintain mutually-acceptable standards for records.
3. Promote the values of timely access and cost effectiveness in cataloging, and expand the pool of catalogers who catalog using the mutually-accepted standards.
4. Increase the sharing and use of bibliographic and authority records from around the world.
5. Provide for ongoing discussion, planning, and operations among participants in order to further the program's mission.

A2.2 History of BIBCO

In October 1995, PCC-member libraries began participating in BIBCO, the newest component of the PCC. Many of the early participants were former National Coordinated Cataloging Program (NCCP) libraries. BIBCO now includes more than forty participating institutions, including the Library of Congress, the National Agricultural Library, and the National Library of Medicine.

One of the emphases of the BIBCO program has been the development of PCC Core standards for different types of materials. The first PCC Core standard was defined in 1994 by one of the Task Groups appointed by the CCC. The Task Group was charged to develop cost-effective

bibliographic standards that would be acceptable to a wide range of libraries. The PCC Core standard is one facet of the PCC's strategy to facilitate an international cooperative cataloging program that provides useful, timely, cost-effective cataloging.

A2. Background

A2.1 History of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging

The Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) is an international cooperative effort aimed at expanding access to library collections by providing useful, timely, and cost-effective cataloging which meets mutually accepted standards of libraries around the world. PCC records are intended to be rich enough in content for inclusion in local catalogs without review by high level staff and reasonable enough in cost to be generated in large numbers.

The PCC was initiated in February 1995 -- a product of deliberations of the Cooperative Cataloging Council (CCC), which began its work in April 1993. The CCC itself was conceived at a meeting of various participants in cooperative library programs that was held at the Library of Congress in November 1992. The CCC envisioned a program that by the year 2000 would annually produce significant numbers of authority and bibliographic records created by an ever-increasing membership of program participants. In November 1996, the CONSER Policy Committee and the PCC Executive Council met to discuss the merging of the two cooperative cataloging programs. The consolidation became effective in October 1997. Today, PCC has four components:

NACO-- Name Authority Cooperative Program (including name and series authority records)
SACO-- Subject Authority Cooperative Program
BIBCO-- Bibliographic Record Cooperative Program (monographic)
CONSER-- Cooperative Online Serials Program

The goals of the PCC are to:

1. Cooperatively enhance the timely availability of bibliographic and authority records by cataloging more items, producing cataloging that is widely available for sharing and use by others, and performing cataloging in a more cost-effective manner.
2. Develop and maintain mutually-acceptable standards for records.
3. Promote the values of timely access and cost effectiveness in cataloging, and expand the pool of catalogers who catalog using the mutually-accepted standards.
4. Increase the sharing and use of bibliographic and authority records from around the world.
5. Provide for ongoing discussion, planning, and operations among participants in order to further the program's mission.

A2.2 History of BIBCO

In October 1995, PCC-member libraries began participating in BIBCO, the newest component of the PCC. Many of the early participants were former National Coordinated Cataloging Program (NCCP) libraries. BIBCO now includes more than forty participating institutions, including the Library of Congress, the National Agricultural Library, and the National Library of Medicine.

One of the emphases of the BIBCO program has been the development of PCC Core standards for different types of materials. The first PCC Core standard was defined in 1994 by one of the Task Groups appointed by the CCC. The Task Group was charged to develop cost-effective

bibliographic standards that would be acceptable to a wide range of libraries. The PCC Core standard is one facet of the PCC's strategy to facilitate an international cooperative cataloging program that provides useful, timely, cost-effective cataloging.

A2.3   BIBCO Today

The BIBCO program has evolved beyond the initial focus on PCC Core record standards. Core records are viewed as one important tool at the cataloger's disposal. The emphasis is on providing timely, reliable access to library materials utilizing cataloger's judgment and the full range of tools that the profession and the Program for Cooperative Cataloging can provide.

The PCC Standing Committee on Standards continues to develop and revise the standards for all types of records. The Standing Committee on Automation continues to explore automated means to streamline description and content analysis of library materials. The Standing Committee on Training continues to identify both broad and specific training needs for catalogers and to develop documentation and training materials for the PCC's programs.

A2.3   BIBCO Today

The BIBCO program has evolved beyond the initial focus on PCC Core record standards. Core records are viewed as one important tool at the cataloger's disposal. The emphasis is on providing timely, reliable access to library materials utilizing cataloger's judgment and the full range of tools that the profession and the Program for Cooperative Cataloging can provide.

The PCC Standing Committee on Standards develops and revises the standards for all types of records. The Standing Committee on Automation explores automated means to streamline description and content analysis of library materials. The Standing Committee on Training identifies both broad and specific training needs for catalogers and develops documentation and training materials for the PCC's programs.

A2.4   Cooperative Cataloging

Cooperative cataloging is the sharing of bibliographic and associated records between libraries to reduce duplication of work. It is founded on the concepts that records created by one library for local control of its resources are sufficiently generalizable that another library can make use of them with little or no modification and on the belief that libraries can accomplish much more by working together than they can individually. BIBCO records are created cooperatively; therefore, information in records created by BIBCO members is accepted by other members, unless the information is obviously erroneous. When questions arise, BIBCO catalogers routinely consult with one another to determine the appropriate action. The BIBCO Coordinator at the Library of Congress, in consultation with appropriate groups, makes the final determination about disputed data in records or records disputed in their entirety.

Cooperative cataloging has a long history in the United States. In 1876, Melville Dewey proposed the preparation of a catalog of printed titles for the common use of libraries. The Library of Congress began in 1898 to print its catalog cards and arranged to exchange them with two or three other large libraries. In 1902, LC began distributing its cataloging data to other libraries via the sale of Library of Congress printed cards. (1) From these fledgling efforts to share the intellectual effort involved in cataloging library resources has developed a vast network of cooperative cataloging activity, embodied in international bibliographic utilities such as OCLC and RLIN and through programs such as the Program for Cooperative Cataloging. The databases of records that are now so widely available form the foundation of many other resource-sharing ventures that are becoming increasingly critical to library service.

Like any cooperative venture, cooperative cataloging depends upon two things to be successful: 1) a set of shared standards and principles and 2) a willingness on the part of the members of the group to contribute as well as to take.

Within the cataloging community, there is a strong foundation of shared standards and principles. MARC coding, widely used since the 1970's, delineates the data elements in a record in such a way to make it possible for libraries to share the records in an automated fashion and to index the data effectively in their local online systems. Other metadata standards are being developed and explored but none has so far been used as extensively or effectively for controlling library resources. Description of library resources within the Anglo-American community (and many countries beyond) is largely achieved through application of the latest edition of the *Anglo American Cataloging Rules* (AACR), with a long tradition within the United States of looking to the Library of Congress for rule interpretations to the cataloging code. Other countries subscribe to IFLA's ISBD standards; there is a strong commitment within the international cataloging community to harmonize AACR and ISBD, whenever possible. There are also shared standards for subject analysis and classification that make cooperative cataloging feasible and cost-effective.

It is the reliance on standards and the perceived cost of adhering to those standards that tempts many library administrators to believe that it is to their library's benefit to limit their participation because they expect that others will contribute everything they need. Such an approach assumes that libraries have a very high degree of overlap in their collections and that another library will place a similar priority on providing access to the same resources. It also overlooks the reality

that, if a sufficient number of libraries were to adopt such an approach, the cooperative venture would die and there would be no records for any library to utilize. Recent figures from one of the world's largest bibliographic databases, OCLC's WorldCat, indicate that over 80% of the records in it have been contributed by member libraries. The question that needs to be asked is: what are the costs of not adhering to standards and not contributing to the cooperative venture? Since American libraries have enjoyed the fruits of a cooperative cataloging environment for many years, it is difficult to say: human beings tend not to appreciate the value of something until it is taken away.

(1) Library of Congress, <u>Cooperative Cataloging Manual</u>, Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1944: p. 5-8.

A2.4   Cooperative Cataloging

Cooperative cataloging is the sharing of bibliographic and associated records between libraries to reduce duplication of work. It is founded on the concepts that records created by one library for local control of its resources are sufficiently generalizable that another library can make use of them with little or no modification and on the belief that libraries can accomplish much more by working together than they can individually. BIBCO records are created cooperatively; therefore, information in records created by BIBCO members is accepted by other members, unless the information is obviously erroneous. When questions arise, BIBCO catalogers routinely consult with one another to determine the appropriate action. The BIBCO Coordinator at the Library of Congress, in consultation with appropriate groups, makes the final determination about disputed data in records or records disputed in their entirety.

Cooperative cataloging has a long history in the United States. In 1876, Melville Dewey proposed the preparation of a catalog of printed titles for the common use of libraries. The Library of Congress began in 1898 to print its catalog cards and arranged to exchange them with two or three other large libraries. In 1902, LC began distributing its cataloging data to other libraries via the sale of Library of Congress printed cards. (1) From these fledgling efforts to share the intellectual effort involved in cataloging library resources has developed a vast network of cooperative cataloging activity, embodied in international bibliographic utilities such as OCLC and RLIN and through programs such as the Program for Cooperative Cataloging. The databases of records that are now so widely available form the foundation of many other resource-sharing ventures that are becoming increasingly critical to library service.

Like any cooperative venture, cooperative cataloging depends upon two things to be successful: 1) a set of shared standards and principles and 2) a willingness on the part of the members of the group to contribute as well as to take.

Within the cataloging community, there is a strong foundation of shared standards and principles. MARC coding, widely used since the 1970's, delineates the data elements in a record in such a way to make it possible for libraries to share the records in an automated fashion and to index the data effectively in their local online systems. Other metadata standards are being developed and explored but none has so far been used as extensively or effectively for controlling library resources. Description of library resources within the Anglo-American community (and many countries beyond) is largely achieved through application of the latest edition of the *Anglo American Cataloging Rules* (AACR), with a long tradition within the United States of looking to the Library of Congress for rule interpretations to the cataloging code. Other countries subscribe to IFLA's ISBD standards. There is a strong commitment within the international cataloging community to harmonize AACR and ISBD, whenever possible. There are also shared standards for subject analysis and classification that make cooperative cataloging feasible and cost-effective.

It is the reliance on standards and the perceived cost of adhering to those standards that tempts many library administrators to believe that it is to their library's benefit to limit their participation. They expect that others will contribute everything that their library needs. Such an approach assumes that libraries have a very high degree of overlap in their collections and that another library will place a similar priority on providing access to the same resources. It also

overlooks the reality that, if a sufficient number of libraries were to adopt such an approach, the cooperative venture would die and there would be no records for any library to utilize. Recent figures from one of the world's largest bibliographic databases, OCLC's WorldCat, indicate that over 80% of the records in it have been contributed by member libraries. The question that needs to be asked is: what are the costs of not adhering to standards and not contributing to the cooperative venture? Since American libraries have enjoyed the fruits of a cooperative cataloging environment for many years, it is difficult to say: human beings tend not to appreciate the value of something until it is taken away.

(1) Library of Congress, <u>Cooperative Cataloging Manual</u>, Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1944: p. 5-8.

A3. **The BIBCO Record**

A3.1 **Definitions**

Authentication. The process of 1) creating or reviewing a non-serial bibliographic record for data content and content designation to ensure that it conforms to BIBCO bibliographic practices and agreed-upon conventions, and 2) adding identifying elements to the record to indicate the degree of authoritativeness of data or the extent to which the record has been reviewed. Authenticated records are made available as contributions to one of the major bibliographic utilities, OCLC or RLIN.

BIBCO record. A bibliographic record for a non serial that has been authenticated by at least one participant in the BIBCO Program. (See examples in Example Section.)

A3.2 **Background**

From the beginning, the BIBCO program was designed to maximize the experience of trained catalogers and minimize the revision of records by an outside person or body. Unlike the earlier National Coordinated Cataloging Program (NCCP), which relied heavily on training and revision done by Library of Congress staff, BIBCO stresses individual cataloger judgment and local institutional needs, within a shared framework of common standards. Training is conducted on site by a cataloger from another BIBCO library and a small sample of records from the newly-trained library is reviewed by the trainer for adherence to BIBCO program standards. Following a short review period, the library is normally released for independent contribution of records. Member libraries are encouraged to conduct quality review of their BIBCO contributions in-house prior to contributing them to one of the bibliographic databases. Other member libraries communicate with one another via their BIBCO liaisons to discuss problems or questions with specific records. In this way, responsibilities for authentication and record maintenance are shared by all the participants of the BIBCO program.

A3.3 **BIBCO Records**

BIBCO records are identifiable by the authentication code of "pcc" present in field 042, as well as by corresponding data elements in byte 17 of the Leader (Encoding Level) and byte 39 of the 008 (cataloging source).

A3.3.1 **Online creation of BIBCO records**

BIBCO participants may contribute new BIBCO bibliographic records or edit existing ones directly in either the OCLC or the RLIN database following the utility's input standards as well as BIBCO program standards.

A3.3.2 **Batchloading of BIBCO records**

BIBCO participants may contribute new BIBCO bibliographic records via OCLC or RLIN batchloading options. Program participants should contact either OCLC or RLIN to explore this option.

A3.4   **Unauthenticated records**

Unauthenticated records are those that have been created or altered by a BIBCO member library without the addition of the code "pcc" in the 042 field and by corresponding data elements in byte 17 of the Leader (Encoding Level) and byte 39 of the 008 (cataloging source).

A3.4.1   **Records created by an institution before it joined BIBCO**

Records contributed to OCLC or RLIN by an institution prior to its becoming a BIBCO participant carry the symbol of that institution in field 040. However, these are not considered BIBCO records because they were not necessarily created following the policies and procedures mandated by the Program.

A3.4.2   **Records modified by a BIBCO participant**

BIBCO institutions may modify an existing record as part of the cataloging process. Modifying an existing record results in the presence of the institution's symbol in field 040. If the record has not been reviewed and authenticated, however, it is not a BIBCO record.

A3.5   **Processing and distribution**

Unlike the process followed for CONSER or NACO records, BIBCO records are not redistributed through a centralized mechanism. There is not a centralized database of BIBCO records. Some libraries contribute their BIBCO records to both major databases, OCLC and RLIN, to facilitate greater record sharing. OCLC and RLIN have discussed the systematic sharing of BIBCO records in the past and agreed in November 2001 to pursue the possibility once again.

A3. **The BIBCO Record**

A3.1 **Definitions**

Authentication. The process of 1) creating or reviewing the data content and content designation of a bibliographic record for a non-serial item to ensure that it conforms to BIBCO bibliographic practices and agreed-upon conventions, and 2) adding identifying elements to the record to indicate the degree of authoritativeness of data or the extent to which the record has been reviewed. Authenticated records are made available as contributions to one of the major bibliographic utilities, OCLC or RLIN.

BIBCO record. A bibliographic record for a non serial that has been authenticated by at least one participant in the BIBCO Program. (See examples in Example Section.)

A3.2 **Background**

From the beginning, the BIBCO program was designed to maximize the experience of trained catalogers and minimize the revision of records by an outside person or body. Unlike the earlier National Coordinated Cataloging Program (NCCP), which relied heavily on training and revision done by Library of Congress staff, BIBCO stresses individual cataloger judgment and local institutional needs, within a shared framework of common standards. Training is conducted on site by a cataloger from another BIBCO library and a small sample of records from the newly-trained library is reviewed by the trainer for adherence to BIBCO program standards. Following a short review period, the library is normally released for independent contribution of records. Member libraries are encouraged to conduct quality review of their BIBCO contributions in-house prior to contributing them to one of the bibliographic databases. Other member libraries communicate with one another via their BIBCO liaisons to discuss problems or questions with specific records. In this way, responsibilities for authentication and record maintenance are shared by all the participants of the BIBCO program.

A3.3 **BIBCO Records**

BIBCO records are identifiable by the authentication code of "pcc" present in field 042, as well as by corresponding data elements in byte 17 of the Leader (Encoding Level) and byte 39 of the 008 (cataloging source).

A3.3.1 **Online creation of BIBCO records**

BIBCO participants may contribute new BIBCO bibliographic records or edit existing ones directly in either the OCLC or the RLIN database following the utility's input standards as well as BIBCO program standards.

A3.3.2 **Batchloading of BIBCO records**

BIBCO participants may contribute new BIBCO bibliographic records via OCLC or RLIN batchloading options. Program participants should contact either OCLC or RLIN to explore this option.

A3.4 **Unauthenticated records**

Unauthenticated records are those that have been created or altered by a BIBCO member library without the addition of the code "pcc" in the 042 field and by corresponding data elements in byte 17 of the Leader (Encoding Level) and byte 39 of the 008 (cataloging source).

A3.4.1 **Records created by an institution before it joined BIBCO**

Records contributed to OCLC or RLIN by an institution prior to its becoming a BIBCO participant carry the symbol of that institution in field 040. However, these are not considered BIBCO records because they were not necessarily created following the policies and procedures mandated by the Program.

A3.4.2 **Records modified by a BIBCO participant**

BIBCO institutions may modify an existing record as part of the cataloging process. Modifying an existing record results in the presence of the modifying institution's symbol in field 040. If the record has not been reviewed and authenticated, however, it is not a BIBCO record.

A3.5 **Processing and distribution**

Unlike the process followed for CONSER or NACO records, BIBCO records are not redistributed through a centralized mechanism. There is not a centralized database of BIBCO records. Some libraries contribute their BIBCO records to both major databases, OCLC and RLIN, to facilitate greater record sharing. While OCLC and RLG have discussed the systematic sharing of BIBCO records in the past, they agreed in November 2001 to pursue the possibility once again.

A4.1   Membership Incentives

What are the principal benefits to libraries of participation in the BIBCO program?

- a ready-made relationship with other like-minded libraries facing similar issues
- being part of a successful cooperative program with the resources and clout to effect needed changes
- an opportunity to participate in establishing priorities and setting cataloging policy at the international level
- an opportunity for service on issue-driven task groups and PCC committees
- access to experts in the field of cooperative cataloging for training, continuing education, advice, and problem solving
- an increased number of bibliographic records that can be utilized in a fast or quick cataloging operation without the need for extensive review
- the opportunity to open dialogues between catalogers and their public-service counterparts about what type of access is needed for library materials
- saving time and money for everyone by increasing the pool of high quality cataloging and authority records that are available for use

What are the principal benefits to catalogers of participation in the BIBCO program?

- access to a group of highly-skilled practitioners to serve as resource people when you have questions or need advice
- the opportunity to hone existing cataloging skills by interaction with some of the very best people in the field
- the opportunity to re-examine local cataloging standards and discuss access needs with local colleagues
- the opportunity to share your expertise widely, produce high-quality cataloging, and save other libraries and catalogers time
- learning about new standards as they are being developed and having a say in the outcome
- learning about new cataloging tools that are being developed and helping to test them
- the opportunity to suggest needed enhancements in training, standards, and automation and to be able to help make them become a reality
- an opportunity for service on issue-driven task groups and PCC committees
- the satisfaction of being part of a successful cooperative program

What are the principal benefits to library users or the cataloging community of the BIBCO program?

- faster access to library materials
- more dependable access to library materials
- a dependable authority record structure to support the bibliographic records

A4.1   Membership Incentives

What are the principal benefits to libraries of participation in the BIBCO program?

- a ready-made relationship with other like-minded libraries facing similar issues
- being part of a successful cooperative program with the resources and clout to effect needed changes
- an opportunity to participate in establishing priorities and setting cataloging policy at the international level
- an opportunity for service on issue-driven task groups and PCC committees
- access to experts in the field of cooperative cataloging for training, continuing education, advice, and problem solving
- the opportunity to open dialogues between catalogers and their public-service counterparts about what type of access is needed for library materials
- saving time and money for everyone by increasing the pool of high quality cataloging and authority records that are available for use

What are the principal benefits to catalogers of participation in the BIBCO program?

- access to a group of highly-skilled practitioners to serve as resource people when you have questions or need advice
- the opportunity to hone existing cataloging skills by interaction with some of the very best people in the field
- the opportunity to re-examine local cataloging standards and discuss access needs with local colleagues
- the opportunity to share your expertise widely, produce high-quality cataloging, and save other libraries and catalogers time
- learning about new standards as they are being developed and having a say in the outcome
- learning about new cataloging tools that are being developed and helping to test them
- the opportunity to suggest needed enhancements in training, standards, and automation and to be able to help make them become a reality
- an opportunity for service on issue-driven task groups and PCC committees
- the satisfaction of being part of a successful cooperative program

What are the principal benefits to library users or the cataloging community of the BIBCO program?

- faster access to library materials
- more dependable access to library materials
- a dependable authority record structure to support the bibliographic records

A4.2 Criteria for Membership

To join BIBCO, a library must:

1.   Be an active, independent NACO contributor.

        Independence in NACO is language specific: catalogers are expected to contribute headings only in languages in which they have proficiency.

2.   Comply with the inputting and editing standards of the utilities to which they contribute the records.

        In the case of OCLC, because of the master record structure of the OCLC database, a library must first have Enhance status in the formats in which it plans to contribute records. Once BIBCO training has been arranged, the BIBCO Coordinator works with an OCLC staff member to obtain a National Enhance authorization for the library in the appropriate formats. OCLC libraries are expected to follow both the Enhance Training Outline (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/enhance/outline.htm) and the Guidelines for National Level Enhance Participants (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/enhance/guidelines.htm)

        In the case of RLIN, RLG does not require special authorization of its member libraries to begin contributing BIBCO records. It is expected that a library will undergo BIBCO training and revision before contributing records to the program.

3.   Agree to abide by the BIBCO Program Parameters (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/parameters.html), including AACR2, ALA-LC Romanization tables, Library of Congress Rule Interpretations, and MARC 21 bibliographic formats.

A4.2   **Criteria for Membership**

To join BIBCO, a library must:

1.   Be an active, independent NACO contributor.

2.   Comply with the inputting and editing standards of the utilities to which they contribute
        the records.

        Because of the master record structure of the OCLC database, an OCLC library must first
        have Enhance status in the formats in which it plans to contribute records. Once BIBCO
        training has been arranged, the BIBCO Coordinator works with an OCLC staff member to
        obtain a National Enhance authorization for the library in the
        appropriate formats. OCLC libraries are expected to follow both the Enhance Training
        Outline (http://www.oclc.org/worldcat/enhance/trainingoutline.shtm) and the Guidelines
        for National Level Enhance Participants
        (http://www.oclc.org/worldcat/enhance/guidelines.shtm)

        RLG does not require special authorization for its member libraries to begin contributing
        BIBCO records. It is expected that a library will undergo BIBCO training and revision
        before contributing records to the program.

3.   Agree to abide by the BIBCO Program Parameters
        (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/parameters.html), including AACR, ALA-LC
        Romanization tables, *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations*, and MARC 21
        bibliographic formats.

BIBCO Application/Information Form
fill in and e-mail to BIBCO Program (acri@loc.gov) or fax to: 202.707.2824

Name of institution:_____

Address:_____

_____

Utility symbol_____ MARC 21 identification code_____

Name of BIBCO contact: (cf. BIBCO FAQ for responsibilities of BIBCO contact)

Name & title:_____

Address:_____

Phone_____Fax_____

E-mail_____

1. Number of staff to be trained for BIBCO:_____

2. Proposed dates for BIBCO Training: _____
3. Number of estimated bibliographic records to be contributed annually
   to the BIBCO Program. Provide estimated total, or break out by type:
   ○ Core:_____Full:_____
   ○ Total:_____
4. Number of bibliographic records created annually (original and
   copy)_____
5. Which is the primary utility for bibliographic work for your
   institution:OCLC_____ RLIN_____
   Other (please explain):_____
6. What is your local system_____
7. If OCLC, do you have Enhance status?_____
   (OCLC members must first apply for Enhance status before joining BIBCO;
   cf. BIBCO FAQ)
8. Will you be contributing in non-book or non-Roman formats?_____
9. What record formats will you be contributing to the BIBCO program:
   (cf. BIBCO FAQ)
   ○ monographs _____
   ○ non-book (please specify)_____

    ❍ non-Roman_____

10. Does your institution also load records to another utility: no_____ yes_____
   Which? OCLC:_____ RLIN:_____ other:_____
11. Does your institution have the capability to export and import bibliographic
   records to or from your local system via FTP: import: yes_____ no _____
   export: no_____ yes_____

NAME of LIBRARY ADMINISTRATOR (Head of Cataloging or Tech. Services, etc.
 if different from BIBCO contact)

Name and title:_____

Address:_____

Phone_____Fax_____

E-mail_____

NAME of LIBRARY DIRECTOR (if different from above)

Name and title:_____

Address:_____

Phone_____Fax_____

E-mail_____

For more information on the BIBCO Program visit the [BIBCO homepage](#)

---

go to:
[Program for Cooperative Cataloging Home Page](#)
[Library of Congress Home Page](#)

 Library of Congress
Comments: lcweb@loc.gov (07/02/01)

A4.4   The Membership Process

Active, independent NACO libraries have a standing invitation to join BIBCO. A library need not contribute series NACO records in order to join but its BIBCO contributions in that case will be limited to Core records or to items for which the SARs have already been established. Besides being an independent NACO library, new participants are asked to attend a training class (usually 2-3 days) held at their own institution. The training is tailored to each institution's needs and is presented by a regional BIBCO trainer. Institutions are asked to assume the cost of travel to and from the training site, the expenses for lodging, and the cost of meals for the trainer. Interested libraries must complete a BIBCO application/information form found on the Web at: (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibcoappl.html).

A4.4.1 Role of the Library of Congress Cooperative Cataloging Team

The Library of Congress Cooperative Cataloging Team (LC Coop Team) has responsibility for overseeing and coordinating the BIBCO, NACO, and SACO programs. In addition, it provides train-the-trainer workshops for individuals seeking to become trainers for those programs. Working closely with the PCC Standing Committee on Training, it maintains lists of current and prospective trainers. The LC Coop Team also collects evaluation forms on training sessions and forwards the results to the Chair of the Standing Committee on Training. When an institution expresses an interest in receiving BIBCO training, the LC Coop Team will work with that institution to make sure that the necessary forms are completed, to explain the overall process, and to work with OCLC member institutions and the OCLC Enhance Coordinator to obtain National Level Enhance status, if necessary. The LC Coop Team puts the institution and a probable trainer in contact so that they can work out the logistics and timing for the training. It also prepares the necessary number of BIBCO Training Manuals and ships them to the institution prior to the training.

A4.4.2 Role of the Standing Committees on Training

The Standing Committee on Training (SCT) is responsible for developing and keeping PCC documentation up to date and providing it to the Library of Congress for distribution. In addition, the SCT is responsible for determining continuing education needs of PCC participants and for working with appropriate organizations and groups to develop and provide continuing education. The SCT works closely with the LC Coop Team and the CONSER coordinator in fulfilling these roles. The Chair of the SCT also works closely with the LC Coop Team in developing lists of current and prospective trainers and in matching up trainers with institutions desiring to become BIBCO participants.

A4.4.3 Role of the PCC Steering Committee

The Program for Cooperative Cataloging seeks to be a democratic and diverse organization whose mission and goals are determined by its membership. The governance structure (see: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/governce.html) is designed to be flexible to allow for rapidly adapting to the changing needs of the organization and its participants. The Steering Committee makes decisions about new members and also reviews continuing membership for participants whose low production or quality has become a cause for concern.

A4.4.4 Role of the PCC Policy Committee

The PCC Policy Committee, whose membership includes permanent representation from the British Library, the Library of Congress, the National Library of Canada, OCLC, and the Research Libraries Group, plays an advisory role in the BIBCO membership process. Its responsibilities are to guide the governance of the Program as a whole; to develop, review, and approve long-term strategies, plans, goals, and objectives; to initiate, review, and approve policy in regard to non-technical matters; to devise criteria for membership; to approve the appointments of standing committee chairs; and to review resource implications of technical policy initiatives and other operational recommendations, e.g., establishing task forces, etc.

A4.4.5 Role of the Bibliographic Utilities

OCLC requires BIBCO participants to be Enhance members first (see: http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/enhance/outline.htm) and then to have National-level Enhance (see: http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/enhance/guidelines.htm) status before being authorized as BIBCO contributors. Enhance applicants send a set number of records with their application in each separate format. Once the application in a given format is accepted, a review of enhanced records commences until a full set complies with the guidelines for Enhance procedures. At their April 1999 meeting the BIBCO Operations Committee asked if some of these requirements could be streamlined. OCLC responded with a restatement of its policies on Record evaluation procedures for OCLC Enhance participants. The PCC strongly endorses OCLC's position in this matter.

RLG does not require any special training or authorization of its members in order for them to contribute BIBCO records, beyond the PCC requirements. It is assumed that RLG institutions have provided training to their catalogers to enable them to contribute bibliographic records which meet the requirements of the PCC.

A4.4.6 Role of the Local BIBCO Liaison

The BIBCO liaison in a library is to act as the point person at his/her institution. Local BIBCO liaisons are expected to function at the operational level in the institutions they represent so that they are able to contribute fully to discussions on technical matters such as cataloging rules and rule interpretations, MARC formats, and other cataloging-related issues. Each institution defines the full range of activities of its BIBCO liaison. Ordinarily, the local BIBCO liaison is responsible for gathering and inputting statistics to the PCC statistics web form on a monthly basis and sending them to the Secretariat. The BIBCO liaison is expected to respond in a timely fashion to queries from other BIBCO member libraries regarding records that the liaison's library has created or upgraded. This individual is also eligible for selection, on a rotational basis, to represent his/her institution on the BIBCO Operations Committee.

A.4.4.7 Role of the BIBCO Operations Committee

The BIBCO Operations Committee is composed of ten representatives from BIBCO libraries, as well as the BIBCO Coordinator at the Library of Congress, and OCLC and RLG liaisons. The

three Standing Committee chairs also attend Operations Committee meetings. The Committee is responsible for maintaining efficient and effective BIBCO activity locally and across the Program, reviewing operational procedures and suggesting changes, assisting with the development and maintenance of documentation through the review of proposed and existing documentation in conjunction with the Standing Committee on Training, and contributing to the development of standards by reviewing and commenting on proposed changes to rules, rule interpretations, MARC formats, or other standards in conjunction with the Standing Committee on Standards. The BIBCO Operations Committee serves as a resource for prospective, new, and continuing BIBCO members. It keeps BIBCO members and potential members informed of current developments that have potential impact on BIBCO policies through communication with the BIBCO Coordinator and through posting notices to appropriate discussion lists. Operations Committee representatives are responsible for interacting with the PCC Standing Committees on Standards, Automation, and Training.

A4.4   The Membership Process

All active, independent NACO libraries have a standing invitation to join BIBCO. A library need not contribute series NACO records in order to join but its BIBCO contributions in that case will be limited to PCC Core records or to items for which the SARs have already been established. Besides being an independent NACO library, new participants are asked to attend a training class (usually 2-3 days) held at their own institution. The training is tailored to each institution's needs and is presented by a regional BIBCO trainer. Institutions are asked to assume the cost of travel to and from the training site, the expenses for lodging, and the cost of meals for the trainer. Interested libraries are requested to complete a BIBCO application/information form found on the Web at: (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibcoappl.html).

A4.4.1 Role of the Library of Congress Cooperative Cataloging Team

The Library of Congress Cooperative Cataloging Team (LC Coop Team) has responsibility for overseeing and coordinating the BIBCO, NACO, and SACO programs. In addition, it provides train-the-trainer workshops for individuals seeking to become trainers for those programs. Working closely with the PCC Standing Committee on Training, it maintains lists of current and prospective trainers. The LC Coop Team also collects evaluation forms on training sessions and forwards the results to the Chair of the Standing Committee on Training. When an institution expresses an interest in receiving BIBCO training, the LC Coop Team will work with that institution to make sure that the necessary forms are completed, to explain the overall process, and to work with OCLC member institutions and the OCLC Enhance Coordinator to obtain National Level Enhance status, if necessary. The LC Coop Team puts the institution and a BIBCO trainer in contact so that they can work out the logistics and timing for the training. It also prepares the necessary number of BIBCO Training Manuals and ships them to the institution prior to the training.

A4.4.2 Role of the Standing Committees on Training

The Standing Committee on Training (SCT) is responsible for developing and keeping PCC documentation up to date and providing it to the Library of Congress for distribution. In addition, the SCT is responsible for determining continuing education needs of PCC participants and for working with appropriate organizations and groups to develop and provide continuing education. The SCT works closely with the LC Coop Team and the CONSER coordinator in fulfilling these roles. The Chair of the SCT also works closely with the LC Coop Team in developing lists of current and prospective trainers and in matching up trainers with institutions interested in becoming BIBCO participants.

A4.4.3 Role of the PCC Steering Committee

The Program for Cooperative Cataloging seeks to be a democratic and diverse organization whose mission and goals are determined by its membership. The governance structure (see: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/governce.html) is designed to be flexible to allow for rapidly adapting to the changing needs of the organization and its participants. The Steering Committee makes decisions about new members and also reviews continuing membership for participants whose low production or quality has become a cause for concern.

A4.4.4 Role of the PCC Policy Committee

The PCC Policy Committee, whose membership includes permanent representation from the British Library, the Library of Congress, the National Library of Canada, OCLC, and the Research Libraries Group, plays an advisory role in the BIBCO membership process. Its responsibilities are to guide the governance of the Program as a whole; to develop, review, and approve long-term strategies, plans, goals, and objectives; to initiate, review, and approve policy in regard to non-technical matters; to devise criteria for membership; to approve the appointments of standing committee chairs; and to review resource implications of technical policy initiatives and other operational recommendations, e.g., establishing task forces, etc.

A4.4.5 Role of the Bibliographic Utilities

OCLC requires BIBCO participants to be Enhance members first (see: http://www.oclc.org/worldcat/enhance/trainingoutline.shtm) and then to have National-level Enhance status (see: http://www.oclc.org/worldcat/enhance/guidelines.shtm) before being authorized as BIBCO contributors. Enhance applicants send a prescribed number of records with their application. Each bibliographic format requires a separate Enhance evaluation.
Once the application in a given format is accepted, a review of enhanced records commences until a full set complies with the guidelines for Enhance procedures. At their April 1999 meeting the BIBCO Operations Committee asked if some of these requirements could be streamlined. OCLC responded with a restatement of its policies on Record evaluation procedures for OCLC Enhance participants. The PCC strongly endorses OCLC's position in this matter. To request national-level Enhance authorization, members should contact their regional network or Jay Weitz at OCLC (800-848-5878; email: weitzj@oclc.org). Before granting the authorization, OCLC staff will confer with the BIBCO Coordinator to verify that the library has received or is about to receive the necessary training. OCLC participants who are already authorized for Regular Enhance for a specific format will then be upgraded to National Enhance in the same format without further evaluation. Those who are not already Enhance participants will need to complete the usual Enhance evaluation.

RLG does not require any special training or authorization of its members in order for them to contribute BIBCO records, beyond the PCC requirements. It is assumed that RLG institutions have provided training to their catalogers to enable them to contribute bibliographic records which meet the requirements of the PCC. RLG does caution its members that, if they derive from a BIBCO record and add, delete, or change existing information to meet their local needs, but they are not BIBCO participants, they need to add the 040 $d and delete the 042 field in their copy of the record.

A4.4.6 Role of the Local BIBCO Liaison

The BIBCO liaison in a library is to act as the point person at his/her institution. Local BIBCO liaisons are expected to function at the operational level in the institutions they represent so that they are able to contribute fully to discussions on technical matters such as cataloging rules and rule interpretations, MARC formats, and other cataloging-related issues. Each institution defines the full range of activities of its BIBCO liaison. Ordinarily, the local BIBCO liaison is responsible

for gathering and inputting statistics to the PCC statistics web form on a monthly basis and sending them to the Secretariat. The BIBCO liaison is expected to respond in a timely fashion to queries from other BIBCO member libraries regarding records that the liaison's library has created or upgraded. This individual is also eligible for selection, on a rotational basis, to represent his/her institution on the BIBCO Operations Committee.

A.4.4.7 Role of the BIBCO Operations Committee

The BIBCO Operations Committee is composed of ten representatives from BIBCO libraries, as well as the BIBCO Coordinator at the Library of Congress, and OCLC and RLG liaisons. The three Standing Committee chairs also attend Operations Committee meetings. The Committee is responsible for maintaining efficient and effective BIBCO activity locally and across the Program, reviewing operational procedures and suggesting changes, assisting with the development and maintenance of documentation through the review of proposed and existing documentation in conjunction with the Standing Committee on Training, and contributing to the development of standards by reviewing and commenting on proposed changes to rules, rule interpretations, MARC formats, or other standards in conjunction with the Standing Committee on Standards. The BIBCO Operations Committee serves as a resource for prospective, new, and continuing BIBCO members. It keeps BIBCO members and potential members informed of current developments that have potential impact on BIBCO policies through communication with the BIBCO Coordinator and through posting notices to appropriate discussion lists. Operations Committee representatives are responsible for interacting with the PCC Standing Committees on Standards, Automation, and Training.

A4.5.1 Authorization

In order to contribute records as BIBCO records in one of the utilities, participants must have the proper authorization. Regardless of the method of contribution, all BIBCO contributors must first undergo training and review (see A4.5.3 and A4.5.4).

Those libraries planning to contribute via OCLC must request a national-level Enhance authorization via an OCLC authorization request form. This authorization will allow the new member to update and replace even national-level records on OCLC. To request national-level Enhance authorization, members should contact their regional network or Jay Weitz at OCLC (800-848-5878; email: weitzj@oclc.org). Before granting the authorization, OCLC staff will confer with the BIBCO Coordinator to verify that the library has received or is about to receive the necessary training. OCLC participants who are already authorized for Regular Enhance for a specific format will then be upgraded to National Enhance in the same format without further evaluation. Those who are not already Enhance participants will need to complete the usual Enhance evaluation. It should also be noted that each bibliographic format requires a separate Enhance evaluation. OCLC BIBCO participants are also expected to follow the *Enhance Training Outline* and *Guidelines for National-Level Enhance Participants.*

RLG members who have undergone BIBCO training may begin to code as "pcc" those records that meet the standards without needing to receive a new authorization from RLG. RLG does caution its members that, if they derive from a BIBCO record and add, delete, or change existing information to meet their local needs, but they are not BIBCO participants, they need to add the 040 $d and delete the 042 field in their copy of the record.

A4.5.1 Authorization

In order to contribute records as BIBCO records in one of the utilities, participants must have the proper authorization. Regardless of the method of contribution, all BIBCO contributors must first undergo training and review (see A4.5.3 and A4.5.4).

As detailed in A4.4.5, those libraries planning to contribute via OCLC must request a national-level Enhance authorization via an OCLC authorization request form. This authorization will allow the new member to update and replace even national-level records on OCLC. OCLC BIBCO participants are also expected to follow the *Enhance Training Outline* and *Guidelines for National-Level Enhance Participants.*

RLG members who have undergone BIBCO training may begin to code as "pcc" those records that meet the standards without needing to receive a new authorization from RLG.

A4.5.2   BIBCO Documentation

Participants are expected to use the most current edition (including updates where applicable) or Cataloger's Desktop, when available, of the following publications. Some documentation may be available exclusively in print or electronic form. Participants are expected to consult the issuing agencies for information on how to obtain the most current documentation.

Descriptive Cataloging and Authorities

- *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*

- *Approved Core Record Standards*, available on the BIBCO Web Site (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco.html)

- *BIBCO Training Manual*

- BIBCO Web Site (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco.html)

- *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations*, 1990. Updates issued quarterly.

- *MARC 21 Format for Authority Data,* 1999 (http://lcweb.loc.gov/marc/authority/ecadlist.html)

- *MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data*, 1999. (http://lcweb.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/ecbdlist.html)

- *NACO Participants' Manual*

Classification and Subject Analysis

Because BIBCO participants may utilize any classification or subject heading scheme authorized by the *MARC 21* formats, catalogers should consult the printed and online documentation available for the different schemes when creating or upgrading bibliographic records.

Those participants using LCSH and LC Classification are expected to adhere to the principles and policies for its application and formulation as stated in current documentation issued by LC.

- *Library of Congress Classification Schedules*

- *Subject Cataloging Manual : Subject Headings*

- *Subject Cataloging Manual : Classification*

- *Free-Floating Subdvisions : An Alphabetical Index 12th ed.*

- *SACO Participants' Manual*

- SACO Web site (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/saco.html)

Those participants using MeSH and NLM classification are expected to adhere to the principles and policies for its application and formulation as stated in current documentation issued by the National Library of Medicine.

- *NLM Classification*

- *NLM Classification Fact Sheet*
- (http://www.nlm.nih.gov/pubs/factsheets/nlmclassif.html)

- *MeSH*

- *MeSH, Annotated Alphabetic List*

- *MeSH Tree Structures*

- *Permuted MeSH*

- *Application of MeSH for Medical Catalogers*
  (http://www.nlm.nih.gov/tsd/cataloging/catmesh.html)

- Medical Subject Heading Web site (http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/meshhome.html)

OCLC Documentation

- OCLC cataloging documentation is available on the OCLC Web site at:
  (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/documentation.htm)

- The *Enhance Training Outline* must be applied by OCLC members contributing BIBCO records via OCLC: (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/enhance/outline.htm)

- *Guidelines for National Level Enhance Participants* must be applied by OCLC members contributing BIBCO records via OCLC:
  (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/enhance/guidelines.htm)

RLIN Documentation

- RLIN cataloging documentation is available on the RLIN Information Center Web site at: (http://www.rlg.org/ric/ric.html)

A4.5.2   BIBCO Documentation

Participants are expected to use the most current edition (including updates where applicable) or Cataloger's Desktop, when available, of the following publications. Some documentation may be available exclusively in print or electronic form. Participants are expected to consult the issuing agencies for information on how to obtain the most current documentation.

Descriptive Cataloging and Authorities

- *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*

- *Approved Core Record Standards*, available on the BIBCO Web Site (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco.html)

- *BIBCO Training Manual*

- BIBCO Web Site (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco.html)

- *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations*, 1990. Updates issued quarterly.

- *MARC 21 Format for Authority Data*, 1999 (http://lcweb.loc.gov/marc/authority/ecadlist.html)

- *MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data*, 1999. (http://lcweb.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/ecbdlist.html)

- *NACO Participants' Manual*

Classification and Subject Analysis

Because BIBCO participants may utilize any classification or subject heading scheme authorized by the *MARC 21* formats, catalogers should consult the printed and online documentation available for the different schemes when creating or upgrading bibliographic records.

Those participants using LCSH and LC Classification are expected to adhere to the principles and policies for its application and formulation as stated in current documentation issued by LC.

- *Library of Congress Classification Schedules*

- *Subject Cataloging Manual : Subject Headings*

- *Subject Cataloging Manual : Classification*

- *Free-Floating Subdvisions : An Alphabetical Index 12th ed.*

- *SACO Participants' Manual*

- SACO Web site (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/saco.html)

Those participants using MeSH and NLM classification are expected to adhere to the principles and policies for its application and formulation as stated in current documentation issued by the National Library of Medicine.

- *NLM Classification*

- *NLM Classification Fact Sheet*
  (http://www.nlm.nih.gov/pubs/factsheets/nlmclassif.html)

- *MeSH*

- *MeSH, Annotated Alphabetic List*

- *MeSH Tree Structures*

- *Permuted MeSH*

- *Application of MeSH for Medical Catalogers*
  (http://www.nlm.nih.gov/tsd/cataloging/catmesh.html)

- Medical Subject Heading Web site (http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/meshhome.html)

Those participants using the Dewey Decimal classification are expected to adhere to the principles and policies for its application and formulation as stated in current documentation issued by the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee (EPC)

- *Dewey Decimal Classification*

OCLC Documentation

- OCLC cataloging documentation is available on the OCLC Web site at:
  (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/documentation.htm)

- The *Enhance Training Outline* must be applied by OCLC members contributing BIBCO records via OCLC: (http://www.oclc.org/worldcat/enhance/trainingoutline.shtm)

- *Guidelines for National Level Enhance Participants* must be applied by OCLC members contributing BIBCO records via OCLC:
  (http://www.oclc.org/worldcat/enhance/guidelines.shtm)

RLIN Documentation

- RLIN cataloging documentation is available on the RLIN Information Center Web site at:
  (http://www.rlg.org/ric/ric.html)

Local Documentation

It is expected that BIBCO libraries will apply BIBCO standards within the context of their local environment. Libraries are expected to supplement the above standards documentation with their own policy and procedural documentation.

A4.5.3   Initial Training

New participants are asked to attend a training class (usually 2-3 days) held at their own institution. The training is tailored to each institution's needs and is presented by an authorized BIBCO trainer. The LC Cooperative Cataloging Team (LC Coop Team), in consultation with the Chair of the Standing Committee on Training, identifies an available BIBCO trainer. Because institutions are asked to assume the cost of travel to and from the training site, the expenses for lodging, and the cost of meals for the trainer, the LC Coop Team tries to identify someone from a nearby geographic area in order to reduce travel costs.

It is not necessary to have additional training in order to contribute records to BIBCO in the non-book formats or for materials in non-roman languages. However, if a library is an OCLC member, that library must first have Enhance status and must also apply for National level Enhance status in that specific format before proceeding to contribute records to BIBCO in that format. There is no equivalent requirement for RLG members. However, it is assumed that RLG institutions have provided training to their catalogers to enable them to contribute bibliographic records in the non-book formats which meet the requirements of the PCC.

Once a trainer has been designated, it becomes the trainer's responsibility to discuss specific training needs and expectations with the institution. The timing of the training, number of attendees, specially-tailored content, the classroom logistics, and the review process following training are usually negotiated between the hosting institution and the trainer.

Once a BIBCO workshop is scheduled, catalogers at the host institution are usually asked to fill in a Pre-Training Cataloger Survey (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/catsurvey.html) to help the trainer develop a sense of the catalogers' familiarity with the PCC, areas of cataloging expertise, and specific cataloging interests. This cataloger survey is sent directly to the trainer.

During the workshop and in follow-up review, it is expected that the differences between Full and Core cataloging will be thoroughly explored. The trainer or reviewer will make certain that the workshop participants fully understand the application of both standards. The decision to submit BIBCO records at the Full or Core level is, however, an institutional one.

A4.5.4   **Review**

A4.5.4.1   **Background:**

One of the criticisms of past cooperative programs was the fact that they involved lengthy and cumbersome review processes that placed little emphasis on cataloger judgment. The BIBCO program places a high premium on cataloger judgment and having libraries become independent contributors as quickly as possible. Nevertheless, it is recognized that there must also be a review process to give credibility to Program records. The following guidelines are intended to assist reviewers and reviewees in understanding the expectations and the mechanisms of review.

A4.5.4.2   **Assumptions:**

1. The library being trained will designate a contact person who will serve as the last line of review before forwarding records to the BIBCO trainer/reviewer. This person should be in a position to articulate and comment on institutional policy;

2. Generally, the trainer will review the work of the library he/she trains;

3. The trainer/reviewer will take into consideration the institution's local policies:

   - what are the policies for series, i.e. has the library been trained to contribute SARs via NACO? What are the local treatment decisions and how will they impact PCC contribution?
   - what are the policies for Program records? Core level? Full level? If they create both, what are the criteria for applying the different standards? Who makes the decision (the institution? the various units within the institution? the individual cataloger?)
   - what are the policies for the use of notes, subject headings and added entries?
   - what classification system is being used?
   - what other local practices will influence decisions made in creating Program records?

4. A Library will be considered a BIBCO library with the successful completion of the review.

A4.5.4.3   **Review process:**

1. Arrangements for review will be made on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the library, the trainer/reviewer, the PCC Secretariat and the utility. Method for review will be dependent upon the library's method of contribution.

2. Generally, a library would be expected to submit approximately 20 records per cataloger for review over a period of time. Therefore, a library with 6 catalogers could expect to submit approximately 120 records for review. Records will normally be reviewed prior to their contribution to the utility. It is expected that the review period will follow immediately after the training, and be completed in a timely fashion. The decision to apply Full or Core standards is an institutional one and the reviewer will ascertain only that the standards have been appropriately followed, depending on the level of records submitted for review. After the review period, it is the institution's responsibility to maintain the quality of its records.

3. Responsibilities of the library under review are to:

   - Provide reviewer with access to records prior to their contribution to the shared database(s) by means of faxed copies, access to local systems, or access to the institution's utility account
   - Respond to reviewer's questions promptly
   - Make corrections to records noted by reviewer

4. Responsibilities of the reviewer are to:

   - Provide timely feedback so that local workflows or contribution of records to the shared database are not adversely affected. The review of records will usually take place within 2 to 3 working days. It is the reviewer's responsibility to notify the institution if a longer time period is necessary.
   - Report serious cataloging errors to the institutional contact
   - Consult with the library and the PCC Secretariat if problems persist in order to determine if additional training is necessary

5. After notification from the reviewer, the PCC Secretariat will notify a library that it has successfully completed the review process and is independent. If there are disputes between the reviewer and the library, they will be resolved by the Secretariat

A4.5.4.4   Criteria for evaluation:

1. Are the standards being applied correctly?

   - appropriate encoding level
   - 042 present
   - all access points represented in the national authority file (NAF and SAF)
   - a standard classification number present in bibliographic record for formats which require one
   - all mandatory fixed and variable fields present
   - descriptive cataloging follows AACR2 and LCRIs
   - enhancements to existing records meet input standards of the utility
   - enhancements to existing records meet Program standards

A4.5.4.5 **Reinforcement of PCC goals:**

1. Keep in mind/reinforce the PCC goals of timely access and cost effectiveness

2. Keep in mind/reinforce PCC values and reliance on cataloger judgment.

- Answers to catalogers' questions should be framed in terms of the individual institution's policies and priorities, within the context of the Program.
- Modifications to existing records should be made to meet local needs or to correct errors rather than to attempt to make a "perfect" record

A4.5.4   **Review**

A4.5.4.1   **Background:**

A criticism of past cooperative programs was that they involved lengthy and cumbersome review processes that placed little emphasis on cataloger judgment. The BIBCO program places a high premium on cataloger judgment and having libraries become independent contributors as quickly as possible. Nevertheless, it is recognized that there must also be a review process to give credibility to Program records.   The following guidelines are intended to assist reviewers and reviewees in understanding the expectations and the mechanisms of review.

A4.5.4.2   **Assumptions:**

1. The library being trained will designate a contact person who will serve as the last line of review before forwarding records to the BIBCO trainer/reviewer. This person should be in a position to articulate and comment on institutional policy;

2. Generally, the trainer will review the work of the library he/she trains;

3. The trainer/reviewer will take into consideration the institution's local policies:

   - what are the policies for series, i.e. has the library been trained to contribute SARs via NACO? What are the local treatment decisions and how will they impact PCC contribution?
   - what are the policies for Program records? Core level? Full level? If they create both, what are the criteria for applying the different standards? Who makes the decision (the institution? the various units within the institution? the individual cataloger?)
   - what are the policies for the use of notes, subject headings and added entries?
   - what classification system is being used?
   - what other local practices will influence decisions made in creating Program records?

4. A Library will be considered a BIBCO library with the successful completion of the review.

A4.5.4.3   **Review process:**

1. Arrangements for review will be made on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the library, the trainer/reviewer, the PCC Secretariat and the utility. Method for review will be dependent upon the library's method of contribution.

2. Generally, a library would be expected to submit approximately 20 records per cataloger for review over a period of time. Therefore, a library with 6 catalogers could expect to submit approximately 120 records for review. Records will normally be reviewed prior to their contribution to the utility. It is expected that the review period will follow immediately after the training, and be completed in a timely fashion. The decision to apply PCC Full or PCC Core standards is an institutional one and the reviewer will ascertain only that the standards have been appropriately followed, depending on the level of records submitted for review. After the review period, it is the institution's responsibility to maintain the quality of its records.

3. Responsibilities of the library under review are to:

   - Provide reviewer with access to records prior to their contribution to the shared database(s) by means of faxed copies, access to local systems, or access to the institution's utility account
   - Respond to reviewer's questions promptly
   - Make corrections to records noted by reviewer

4. Responsibilities of the reviewer are to:

   - Provide timely feedback so that local workflows or contribution of records to the shared database are not adversely affected. The review of records will usually take place within 2 to 3 working days. It is the reviewer's responsibility to notify the institution if a longer time period is necessary
   - Report serious cataloging errors to the institutional contact
   - Consult with the library and the PCC Secretariat if problems persist in order to determine if additional training is necessary

5. After notification from the reviewer, the PCC Secretariat will notify a library that it has successfully completed the review process and is independent. If there are disputes between the reviewer and the library, they will be resolved by the Secretariat

A4.5.4.4   Criteria for evaluation:

1. Are the standards being applied correctly?

   - appropriate encoding level
   - 042 present
   - all access points represented in the national authority file (NAF and SAF)
   - a standard classification number present in bibliographic record for formats which require one
   - all mandatory fixed and variable fields present
   - descriptive cataloging follows AACR and LCRIs
   - enhancements to existing records meet input standards of the utility
   - enhancements to existing records meet Program standards

A4.5.4.5   **Reinforcement of PCC goals:**

1. Keep in mind/reinforce the PCC goals of timely access and cost effectiveness

2. Keep in mind/reinforce PCC values and reliance on cataloger judgment.

- Answers to catalogers' questions should be framed in terms of the individual institution's policies and priorities, within the context of the Program.
- Modifications to existing records should be made to meet local needs or to correct errors rather than to attempt to make a "perfect" record

A4.5.5   Statistics

The PCC Secretariat at the Library of Congress is responsible for compiling and posting the statistics for each of the BIBCO libraries on a monthly basis. However, each BIBCO library is responsible for collecting and reporting statistics to the Secretariat.

The current method of reporting statistics involves completing a Web form. When a library becomes a BIBCO participant, the LC Coop Team creates a reporting page for the institution and sends instructions for accessing and filling in the form. Each institution submits one statistics report each month by filling in the Web page as early in the next month as possible. The LC Coop Team runs a program around the 15th of each month to collect the statistics and then displays them on the centralized Web page (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/stats/stats.html). If an institution misses reporting before the 15th, the Coop Team will send a reminder and will list a zero for the institution for that month. The BIBCO Liaison may contact someone from the Coop Team to have the numbers adjusted or the institution may simply add the missing statistics to the next month's report. Every BIBCO member library should review the online statistics display for accuracy throughout the year. Technical or data accuracy problems should be reported to the Coop Team.

Statistics for each institution are collected in the following categories:

- New Full Program Records (this means any record regardless of format which is new to the BIBCO Program, whether it is an original record or has been upgraded from existing copy).
- New Core Program Records (this means any record regardless of format which is new to the BIBCO Program, whether it is an original record or has been upgraded from existing copy).
- LC Bib File Maintenance (applies only to libraries working within the LC database)

A4.6   Review of Continuing Membership

Unlike the CONSER program, there is no formal review process for continuing membership in BIBCO. However, there is an expectation that institutions will participate actively in BIBCO and its supporting programs, within the context of local staffing and cataloging needs. The LC Secretariat will identify institutions whose low production or quality becomes a cause for concern, bringing these concerns to the attention of the PCC Steering Committee. After review of the institution's performance, the Steering Committee will, if appropriate, ask the Secretariat to initiate a six month review of the member institution's contributions with appropriate notification to the institution under review. Following the initial six-month review period, the Steering Committee will evaluate the status of the member institution's activity to ascertain if improvement, i.e., increased production levels, has been demonstrated. Should the Steering Committee deem it necessary, it may initiate an additional six-month review period. If the desired improvement has not been realized after this second six-month review, the chair of the Policy Committee will notify the institution that its membership in the BIBCO program has been concluded.

A4.6.1 Quality of records

New participants agree to have their records reviewed for compliance to the established guidelines following the BIBCO training. The duration of the review period will be determined by the reviewer in consultation with the institution's BIBCO liaison and/or the BIBCO Coordinator. Following the initial training and review, there is no formal review process of an institution's records. The individual institution is expected to monitor the ongoing quality of its contributions and to respond promptly to questions from other libraries about their records. BIBCO participants agree to maintain open lines of communication with other PCC partners and especially with other BIBCO members in an effort to encourage the precept that the responsibility for maintaining the integrity of Program records is shared by all participants.

A4.6.2 Volume of Activity

There is no predetermined volume of activity for BIBCO libraries. BIBCO participants are not required to designate all their cataloging as BIBCO records (042 = pcc), nor to designate some percentage of their BIBCO contributions as Core. BIBCO institutions do agree to make available in a timely manner their BIBCO designated bibliographic records (042=pcc) via the bibliographic utilities. If production remains low for an extended period of time, the library may be placed on review, as explained in A4.6 above.

A4.6.3 Type of Activity

As members of BIBCO, participants may contribute bibliographic records for monographs in any format to the national databases. In support of BIBCO bibliographic records, BIBCO libraries must contribute NACO records, as explained in Section B1.4. Those libraries using LCSH are also expected to contribute SACO proposals (see B1.4.4.1) when a new subject heading is needed. BIBCO libraries also participate in the development of standards.

A4.6.4 Participation

BIBCO institutions agree to appoint a BIBCO liaison who is then eligible for rotational assignment to the BIBCO Operations Committee (see also A4.4.7). This includes providing institutional support, at minimum the time necessary, for the individual to attend the Committee's annual meeting and to participate in BIBCO undertakings. In addition, each institution is asked to contribute to the annual report for the program each year by submitting a summary of its activity in the program for the previous year.

A5. PCC Governance Document: Management and Meeting Structure

A5.1 Introduction

The Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) is an international effort aimed at expanding timely access to materials in libraries' collections. The program seeks to increase the timely availability of unique records created and maintained under mutually-acceptable standards; to facilitate the cost-effective creation and use of these records; and to provide leadership in the information community. The PCC supports the creation and dissemination of bibliographic and authority records, including names, subjects, and series.

A5.1.1 Component Programs and their Membership

A. BIBCO

Membership Levels:
    Full (voting)
    Affiliate (non-voting)

As members of BIBCO, participants contribute bibliographic records for monographs in all formats to the national databases and participate in the development of standards. An individual institution may join this program, or a group of libraries with a common interest may form a funnel project to contribute via a coordinator who will represent the funnel participants. For-profit organizations participate in BIBCO at the Affiliate level.

B. CONSER

Membership Levels:
    Full (voting)
    Associate (non-voting)
    CONSER Enhance (non-voting)
    Affiliate (non-voting)

As members of CONSER, participants contribute bibliographic records for serials in all formats and participate in the development of serial standards. Full and Associate members authenticate CONSER records and maintain the CONSER database; Enhance and Affiliate members contribute to the maintenance of CONSER records. An individual institution may join this program, or a group of libraries with a common interest may form a funnel project to contribute via a coordinator who will represent the funnel participants. For-profit organizations participate in CONSER at the Affiliate level.

C. NACO

Membership Levels:
    Full (voting)
    Affiliate (non-voting)

As members of NACO, participants contribute authority records to the national authority file. An individual institution may join this program, or a group of libraries with a common interest may form a funnel project to contribute via a coordinator who will represent the funnel participants. For-profit organizations participate in NACO at the Affiliate level.

D. SACO

Membership Levels:
    Affiliate (non-voting)

As members of SACO, participants contribute proposals for subject headings to LCSH and classification numbers to LC Classification. SACO-only participants are represented by the Secretariat.

A5.2 Governance

The Program for Cooperative Cataloging seeks to be a democratic and diverse organization whose mission and goals are determined by its membership. The governance structure will be flexible to allow for rapid adaptation to the changing needs of the organization and its participants. Guiding the PCC is the Policy Committee. The Steering Committee works with the Library of Congress, which serves as Secretariat, to manage the Program. Operations Committees for BIBCO and CONSER and three Standing Committees on Automation, Standards, and Training complete the PCC governance structure. Revisions to the existing governance structure will be made by the Secretariat at the direction of the Policy Committee.

A5.2.1 Policy Committee

A. Composition

The Policy Committee will be composed of thirteen voting plus 6 non-voting members.

Voting members:
    Permanent:
    One representative each from:
    British Library
    Library of Congress
    National Library of Canada
    OCLC
    Research Libraries Group

    Rotating:
    Representatives from full, active participants in:
        BIBCO (3)
        CONSER (3)
        NACO (2)

Non-voting members:
    Five committee chairs
    Representative from the Secretariat

Voting members will be limited to policy level personnel. The term of office for rotating members will be staggered three-years terms. If a member cannot complete a term the Steering Committee will appoint a representative to complete that term. Members will serve no more than two consecutive terms.

B. Chair and Chair-Elect.

The Chair and Chair-Elect of the Policy Committee will be elected by the members of the Policy Committee. BIBCO and/or CONSER institution representatives will be eligible for election as Chair.

The Chair will serve one year, to commence 1 October. If the Chair cannot serve out his or her term, the Chair-Elect will serve the remainder of the term, plus his or her own term. The Policy Committee will immediately elect a new Chair-Elect.

The Chair-Elect will be elected at the beginning of the Chair's tenure and will serve one year as Chair-Elect and one year as Chair.

C. Responsibilities and Meeting Structure

The responsibilities of the Policy Committee will be to guide the governance of the Program as a whole; to develop, review, and approve long term strategies, plans, goals, and objectives; to initiate, review, and approve policy in regard to non-technical matters; to devise criteria for membership; to approve the appointments of standing committee chairs; and to review resource implications of technical policy initiatives and other operational recommendations, e.g., establishing task forces, etc.

The Policy Committee will meet once a year in one or two full day sessions, usually in the fall. Reports of Policy Committee meetings will be distributed to PCC participants and liaisons from other organizations.

A5.2.2 Steering Committee

A. Composition

The committee will be composed of five members: three permanent members representing the Library of Congress, OCLC, and the Research Libraries Group; and the Chair and Chair-Elect of the Policy Committee. The Chair of the Policy Committee will also serve as Chair of the Steering Committee. The Secretariat's representative will serve in a non-voting capacity on the Steering Committee.

B. Responsibilities and Meeting Structure

The Secretariat will forward membership applications to the Steering Committee, with its recommendation for approval or disapproval. The final decision will rest with the Steering Committee, which will inform the Policy Committee of its decision. The Steering Committee will poll Committee representatives and other members in regard to important issues that arise between regularly scheduled meetings and make decisions, as appropriate; direct the strategic planning process for the Program; and seek and manage resources in support of Program goals.

The Secretariat will identify institutions whose low production or quality becomes a cause for concern, bringing these concerns to the attention of the Steering Committee. After review of an institution's performance, the Steering Committee will, if appropriate, ask the Secretariat to initiate a six month review of the member institution's contributions with appropriate notification to the institution under review. Following the initial six-month review period, the Steering Committee will evaluate the status of the member institution's activity to ascertain if improvement, i.e., increased production levels, has been demonstrated. Should the Steering Committee deem it necessary, it may initiate an additional six-month review period. If the desired improvement has not been realized after this second six-month review, the chair of the Policy Committee will notify the institution that its membership in the PCC (or a particular component of it) has been concluded.

The Steering Committee will meet three times a year for approximately two or three hours. These meetings will be held in conjunction with ALA conferences and annual Policy Committee meetings.

Minutes will be distributed to Steering Committee members only; reports of action items will be sent to Policy Committee members as appropriate.

A5.2.3 BIBCO Operations Committee

A. Composition

The BIBCO Operations Committee will be composed of ten representatives from BIBCO libraries, the BIBCO Coordinator at the Library of Congress, and OCLC and RLG liaisons. The three Standing Committee chairs will attend committee meetings and receive information distributed to BIBCO operations representatives. The BIBCO Coordinator at the Library of Congress will select the BIBCO operations representatives who will serve on a rotating basis for three year terms in a manner that will ensure that the Operations Committee membership reflects the diversity of the Program and that all BIBCO institutions will have an opportunity to participate in the work of the Operations Committee.[1]

B. Membership

Each BIBCO institution will identify a BIBCO operations representative, who will be eligible for selection as a member of the Operations Committee. Operations representatives will serve as BIBCO liaisons within their own institutions. They must function at the operational level in the institutions they represent so that they are able to contribute fully to discussions on technical matters such as cataloging rules and rule interpretations, MARC formats, and other cataloging-related issues.

C. Responsibilities

The committee will be responsible for maintaining efficient and effective BIBCO activity locally and across the Program; reviewing operational procedures and suggesting changes; developing and maintaining documentation. It will contribute to the development of standards by reviewing and commenting on proposed changes to rules, rule interpretations, MARC formats, or other standards in conjunction with the Standing Committee on Standards. It will keep Program members informed of current developments that have potential impact on Program policies through communication with the BIBCO Coordinator and notices to appropriate discussion lists.

D. Meeting Structure

The BIBCO Coordinator will serve as the Chair of the Operations Committee. BIBCO Operations Committee meetings will be held annually, generally in the spring, at the Library of Congress in conjunction with the annual meetings of the CONSER Operations Committee to facilitate joint discussion. The focus of these meetings will be to review changes to standards or documentation, to resolve issues relating to cataloging, and for the purpose of ongoing training.

All BIBCO representatives, chairs of the PCC Standing Committees, OCLC and RLG liaisons, and appropriate LC staff will be invited to attend.

Reports of meetings will be distributed to PCC members and liaisons from other organizations.

[1] For further detail on the PCC structure and governance see:
http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/governce.html

A.6 Bibliography of Writings on the PCC

Bowen, J. B. (1998). Creating a culture of cooperation. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 26(3), 73-85

> The Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) has aroused controversy by promoting the value of cataloger judgment in its BIBCO program. Because this issue at times eclipses broader discussions about the PCC, it is useful to revisit some long-term values and issues in cooperative cataloging to gain a better understanding of the Program. The PCC is attempting to find realistic approaches to the issues of cost effectiveness and local flexibility while continuing to address the professional values that have historically motivated cooperative cataloging. Participating in the PCC can allow catalogers to reconcile their professional goals with the financial realities of their local institutions.

Calhoun, K. S. and Boissonnas, C. M. (1998). BIBCO: a winning proposition for library users and staff. *Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory*, 22(3), 251-255.

Cato, A. (1996). Working Group on the Core Bibliographic Record for Music and Sound Recordings. *Fontes Artis Musicae*, 43 (Apr./June '96), 208-209.

Cato, A. (1997). Working groups: core bibliographic record for music and sound recordings. *Fontes Artis Musicae*, 44 (Apr./June '97), 188.

The core bibliographic record for music and sound recordings. (1998) *Fontes Artis Musicae*, 45(2), 139-151.

Cromwell, W. (1994) The core record: a new bibliographic standard. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 38 (Oct. '94), 415-424.

Czeck, R. L. H., Icenhower, E., and Kellsey, C. (2000). PCC core records versus PCC full records: differences in access? Program for Cooperative Cataloging at the University of Colorado Libraries. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 29(3), 81-92.

> Using a set of bibliographic records from the OCLC database, records meeting PCC core standard are compared with those meeting PCC full standard. Significant statistical differences are derived for occurrence of specific name and subject access points in core and full records. Implications for OPAC access may inform libraries' policies regarding incorporation of core records in copy cataloging procedures.

Fetch, D. (1999). Core records as copy: a report from the ALCTS CCS Copy Cataloging Discussion Group. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services*, 23(1), 108-110.

Gardner, S. A. (2000). A proposal for core level map cataloging: brief records may be best. *Nebraska Library Association Quarterly,* 31(4), 31-35.

Hirons, J. and Schottlaender, B. (1997). The CONSER/PCC evolution. *Serials Librarian*, 32(1/2), 95-105.

> [Also published in : *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, (1997) 24 (3/4), 37-46.]

> In October 1997, the CONSER Program will join the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC). Hirons and Schottlaender discuss the developments that led up to the consolidation, the new vision for the combined program as expressed in a set of principles, and the benefits to each program. They also examine the potential for change in CONSER and PCC inherent in the acceptance of the principles.

Hixson, C. (2001). Core cataloging for serials: an administrative perspective. *Serials Review*, 27(2), 37-48.

> The development of core standards in the cooperative cataloging environment is briefly discussed, particularly as they apply to serial cataloging. Reasons why administrators and catalogers often react differently to local implementation of the standards are explored and approaches to increase their acceptance and usefulness are suggested.

Hyslop, C. F. (1996). The Program for Cooperative Cataloging. *From Catalog to Gateway*. Supplement no. 8 to the *ALCTS Newsletter*, 7(4), A-D.
  Also available: http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/hyslop1.html [Accessed 01/07/2002].

Hyslop, C. F. (1997). Highlights of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging: the core record and consolidation of CONSER and PCC. *From Catalog to Gateway.* Supplement no. 11 to *ALCTS Newsletter* 8(4), A-D.

Ivany, J. (1998). Cooperative cataloging organizations merge. *OCLC Newsletter* 233 (May/June), 12-13.
  Also available: http://www.oclc.org/oclc/new/n233/mem_coop_cat_merge.htm [Accessed 01/07/2002].

Jones, W. (2000). Gimme a C! MIT's experience with core cataloging of serials. *The Serials Librarian*, 37(3), 41-51.

    Describes the process on the implementation of core-level cataloging of serials at MIT Libraries in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Benefits gained by MIT in adopting serials cataloging; need for adopting serial cataloging in libraries; distinction of core-level cataloging with other levels of cataloging; parts of a serial catalog record and its components.

Kelley, S. L. and Schottlaender, B. (1996). UCLA/OCLC Core Record Pilot Project: preliminary report. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 40 (July '96), 251-260.

Lange, H. R. (1998). Creating core records for federal documents: does it make a difference? *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 26(3), 87994.

    Over the past 18 months, Colorado State University Libraries has used the Library of Congress inspired Program in Cooperative Cataloging's (PCC) core record standard when cataloguing non-depository and pre-1976 federal documents. Although it is not a PCC member, and so not involved in its Bibliographic Record Cooperative Program (BIBCO), it began experimenting with this standard as a means to facilitate a more efficient way of cataloguing US federal documents. Describes the Libraries' decision to use the core standard, describes the core cataloguing standard, noting especially PCC's emphasis on the importance of the cataloguer's judgment in applying the standard and comments on the Libraries' use and assessment of core cataloguing.

Lindlan, K. (2001) Serials cataloging guidelines and levels of catalogingat the University of Washington Libraries. *Serials Review,* 27(20), 9-13.

Liu, W. (1998) An introduction to the core-level record. *Journal of East Asian Libraries*, 116 (Oct. 1998), 41-48.

Maurer, M. B. (1999). Why the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) core records change copy cataloging. *Serials Review*, 26(2), 94-97.

OCLC. (1996). Technical bulletin 213: Program for cooperative cataloging.
Also available: http://www.oclc.org/oclc/tb/tb213/tb213.htm [Accessed 01/07/2002].

Program for Cooperative Cataloging BIBCO Home Page (2001). Washington, DC: Library of Congress Program for Cooperative Cataloging.
  Available: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco.html [Accessed 01/07/2002].

Robare, L. P. (1999). Core records as copy: a report of the ALCTS CCS Copy Cataloging Discussion Group, American Library Association Annual Conference, Washington, D.C., June 1998. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 17(1), 47-49.

Schiff, A. L. (1999). Special libraries and the Program for Cooperative Cataloging. *Information Outlook*, 3(10), 14.

Schuitema, J. E. (1998). Demystifying core records in today's changing catalogs. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 26(3), 57-71.

> The core record standard for books was developed in 1993 under the auspices of the Cooperative Cataloging Council (CCC). Even though core record standards for other formats continue to be developed by CCC's successor, the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) and core records have begun to make their presence known in the bibliographic utilities, there remains a certain amount of wariness surrounding the utility of this new cataloging tool. This paper attempts to introduce the core record concept and to explore issues associated with the implementation of core-level cataloging.

Shadle, S. C. (2001). The Core serial record: where can it save time? *Serials Review,* 27(2), 14-21.

> Serial cataloging record levels (CONSER minimum, core, and full) are discussed and applied in the original cataloging of two serial titles held in the University of Washington Libraries' collection. Specific differences in the resulting MARC records are discussed and those differences that resulted in a significant time savings are identified. This type of analysis can be used to help inform local serials cataloging policy.

Shen, M. (1997). PCC Core records and how to identify them. *TechKNOW*, 3(4).

Shen, M. and Kreider, L. (1999). PCC Core records – some history and practice. *TechKNOW*, 5(3).

Smith, V. T. (1998). Core records: is this the answer to cooperative cataloging? *Journal of Educational Media & Science*, 36(2), 143-161.

Reviews the historical background to the development of core records standards as a means of defining a limited set of data elements essential to the cooperative use of a given set of cataloguing records. The core record standard developed for the USA by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) requires that all core records must have a nationally recognized classification number (Library of Congress, Dewey Decimal Classification or National Library of Medicine (NLM) number) and must have all access points supported by authority records in national authority files (name, subject headings, thesauri). In 1997, the PCC and CONSER joined their operations to become a single unit. Concludes with details of the Core Record Pilot Project, University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) in which it was shown that: cataloguer productivity increased 8.5-17 per cent; full records received 26 per cent more subject headings and 36 per cent more name headings by using core records. Other core record standards under development include: Computer Files Core Record; Core Record for Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books; IAML's UNIMARC core record for music materials; the Visual Resources Association's standard; and the Electronic Access to Medieval Manuscripts Project.

Swanekamp, J. (1998). The changing cataloging culture: what do we mean when we talk about cataloger values? *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 26(3), 51-55.

The Library of Congress inspired Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Standing Committee on Training was charged with the development of a training model to support the Program, promote the values of timely access and cost effectiveness in cataloguing, and to expand the pool of cataloguers who catalogued to mutually accepted standards. Describes the training philosophy developed by the Standing Committee on Training and adopted by the Program. The training model assumes that it is important to maintain an adequate supply of original cataloguing; to accept the concept of a national cataloguing standard; to increase acceptance of cataloguing copy; to avoid duplicative cataloguing; and to increase the timeliness of the contribution to national cataloguing databases.

Tabb, W. (1997). The Program for Cooperative Cataloging: mission, goals, and potential for international cooperation. International Cataloguing and Bibliographic Control, 26(4).

Available: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/tabbpaper.html [Accessed 01/07/2002].

Thomas, S. E. (1996). The core bibliographic record and the Program for Cooperative Cataloging. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 21(3/4), 91-108.

The Program for Cooperative Cataloging seeks to increase the availability of unique records created in a decentralized fashion by a network of libraries according to mutually acceptable standards. A critical element in achieving its mission is the core bibliographic record, a cataloging record that embodies the principles of usefulness, cost-effectiveness, and dynamism. The PCC intends that Program records, full or core, represent acceptable bibliographic control such that record "tweaking" at the local level is minimized. Emphasis is on essential description and on the development of trust in others' bibliographic records, obviating the need for expensive revision and leveraging scarce cataloging resources for grappling with an expanding universe of challenges.

Towards a new beginning in Cooperative Cataloging: the history, progress and future of the Cooperative Cataloging Council. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, Cataloging Distribution Service, 1994.

Documents the early plans and achievements of the Cooperative Cataloging Council (now called the Program for Cooperative Cataloging) -- a joint project between LC's Cataloging Directorate and other U.S. libraries from 1992 to the present.

Zyroff, Ellen (1996). Cataloging is a prime number. *American Libraries*, 27 (May '96), 47-50.

A.6 Bibliography of Writings on BIBCO and PCC Core

Bowen, J. B. (1998). Creating a culture of cooperation. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 26(3), 73-85

Calhoun, K. S. and Boissonnas, C. M. (1998). BIBCO: a winning proposition for library users and staff. *Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory*, 22(3), 251-255.

Cato, A. (1996). Working Group on the Core Bibliographic Record for Music and Sound Recordings. *Fontes Artis Musicae*, 43 (Apr./June '96), 208-209.

Cato, A. (1997). Working groups: core bibliographic record for music and sound recordings. *Fontes Artis Musicae*, 44 (Apr./June '97), 188.

The core bibliographic record for music and sound recordings. (1998) *Fontes Artis Musicae*, 45(2), 139-151.

Cromwell, W. (1994) The core record: a new bibliographic standard. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 38 (Oct. '94), 415-424.

Czeck, R. L. H., Icenhower, E., and Kellsey, C. (2000). PCC core records versus PCC full records: differences in access? Program for Cooperative Cataloging at the University of Colorado Libraries. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 29(3), 81-92.

Fetch, D. (1999). Core records as copy: a report from the ALCTS CCS Copy Cataloging Discussion Group. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services*, 23(1), 108-110.

Gardner, S. A. (2000). A proposal for core level map cataloging: brief records may be best. *Nebraska Library Association Quarterly,* 31(4), 31-35.

Hyslop, C. F. (1996). The Program for Cooperative Cataloging. *From Catalog to Gateway*. Supplement no. 8 to the *ALCTS Newsletter*, 7(4), A-D.
  Also available: http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/hyslop1.html [Accessed 01/07/2002].

Hyslop, C. F. (1997). Highlights of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging: the core record and consolidation of CONSER and PCC. *From Catalog to Gateway.* Supplement no. 11 to *ALCTS Newsletter* 8(4), A-D.

Ivany, J. (1998). Cooperative cataloging organizations merge. *OCLC Newsletter* 233 (May/June), 12-13.
  Also available: http://www.oclc.org/oclc/new/n233/mem_coop_cat_merge.htm [Accessed 01/07/2002].

Kelley, S. L. and Schottlaender, B. (1996). UCLA/OCLC Core Record Pilot Project: preliminary report. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 40 (July '96), 251-260.

Lange, H. R. (1998). Creating core records for federal documents: does it make a difference? *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 26(3), 87994.

Liu, W. (1998) An introduction to the core-level record. *Journal of East Asian Libraries*, 116 (Oct. 1998), 41-48.

OCLC. (1996). Technical bulletin 213: Program for cooperative cataloging.
Also available: http://www.oclc.org/oclc/tb/tb213/tb213.htm [Accessed 01/07/2002].

Program for Cooperative Cataloging BIBCO Home Page (2001). Washington, DC: Library of Congress Program for Cooperative Cataloging.
  Available: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco.html [Accessed 01/07/2002].

Robare, L. P. (1999). Core records as copy: a report of the ALCTS CCS Copy Cataloging Discussion Group, American Library Association Annual Conference, Washington, D.C., June 1998. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 17(1), 47-49.

Schiff, A. L. (1999). Special libraries and the Program for Cooperative Cataloging. *Information Outlook*, 3(10), 14.

Schuitema, J. E. (1998). Demystifying core records in today's changing catalogs. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 26(3), 57-71.

Shen, M. (1997). PCC Core records and how to identify them. *TechKNOW*, 3(4).

Shen, M. and Kreider, L. (1999). PCC Core records – some history and practice. *TechKNOW*, 5(3).

Smith, V. T. (1998). Core records: is this the answer to cooperative cataloging? *Journal of Educational Media & Science*, 36(2), 143-161.

Tabb, W. (1997). The Program for Cooperative Cataloging: mission, goals, and potential for international cooperation. International Cataloguing and Bibliographic Control, 26(4).
   Available: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/tabbpaper.html [Accessed 01/07/2002].

Thomas, S. E. (1996). The core bibliographic record and the Program for Cooperative Cataloging. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 21(3/4), 91-108.

Zyroff, Ellen (1996). Cataloging is a prime number. *American Libraries*, 27 (May '96), 47-50.

A7.   Glossary of Terms, Abbreviations, and Acronyms

AACR2 - *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2nd ed.

Authentication - The process of 1) reviewing a non-serial bibliographic record for data content and content designation to ensure that it conforms to BIBCO bibliographic practices and agreed-upon conventions, and 2) adding identifying elements to the record to indicate the standards followed in the creation or review of the data. Authenticated records are then made available through contribution to one or more of the major bibliographic utilities.

BFM - Bibliographic file maintenance. BIBCO participants are required to identify bibliographic records in LC's catalog which should be changed as a result of a new or modified NACO record submitted in support of a BIBCO record and to notify their Coop Cat liaison of needed changes. LC staff will perform BFM on those bibliographic records.

BIBCO - The monographic bibliographic record component of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco.html)

BIBCO Coordinator – The person within the Library of Congress Cooperative Cataloging Team responsible for coordinating the BIBCO Program nationally.

BIBCO Liaison – The person responsible for coordinating BIBCO activity at a particular institution, for reporting statistics to the Library of Congress, and for responding to inquiries from other BIBCO libraries about that institution's BIBCO records.

Cooperative Cataloging Council – predecessor of the PCC

Core - a minimum set of data elements below which the PCC has agreed program records will not go although the standard itself can be used by any library. The core record standard was defined in 1994 by a Task Group appointed by the Cooperative Cataloging Council. Each format has its own set of minimum data elements that has been defined by the PCC Standing Committee on Standards in consultation with specific cataloging constituencies.

CPSO - Cataloging Policy and Support Office, LC (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/)

Dewey – Dewey Decimal Classification. One of the possible classification schemes for use in BIBCO records.

Integrating resource – A bibliographic resource that is added to or changed by means of updates that do not remain discrete and are integrated into the whole. Examples of integrating resources include updating loose-leafs and updating Web sites.

LC – Library of Congress.

LC Coop Team – Library of Congress Cooperative Cataloging Team, RCCD. The Team responsible for coordination of the BIBCO, NACO, and SACO components of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging.

LCC - Library of Congress Classification. One of the possible classification schemes for use in BIBCO records.

LCRIs or RIs – Library of Congress Rule Interpretations to AACR2. BIBCO participants are required to follow LCRIs in their authority and bibliographic records.

LCSH - Library of Congress Subject Headings. One of the possible schemes of subject headings required in BIBCO records.

MARC - Acronym for <u>MA</u>chine-<u>R</u>eadable <u>C</u>ataloging. It provides the mechanism by which computers exchange, use and interpret bibliographic and related information.
 (http://lcweb.loc.gov/marc/index.html)

MARC21 – The current version of MARC, adopted when the USMARC and CAN/MARC (Canadian MARC) formats were "harmonized" in 1997.

MeSH – Medical Subject Headings. Maintained by the National Library of Medicine. One of possible schemes of subject headings required in BIBCO records.

NACO - Name Authority Cooperative Project (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/naco.html)

NAF - National Authority File. Maintained by the Library of Congress and distributed through OCLC, RLIN, and the British Library. In RLIN, "NAF" is the Name Authority File and "SAF" is the Subject Authority File.

OCLC – Online Computer Library Center, Inc., one of the two major utilities serving as host to BIBCO records. (http://www.oclc.org/home/)

PCC - Program for Cooperative Cataloging (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/)

RCCD – Regional and Cooperative Cataloging Division, Library of Congress

RLG – Research Libraries Group, one of the two major utilities serving as host to BIBCO records (http://www.rlg.org/rlg.html)

RLIN – Research Library Information Network, now called the RLG Union Catalog.

SACO - Subject Authority Cooperative Program (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/saco.html)

SCM - *Subject Cataloging Manual*. Issued in three sections by LC: *Subject Headings*, *Classification*, and *Shelflisting*.

A7.   Glossary of Terms, Abbreviations, and Acronyms

AACR - *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*

Authentication - The process of 1) reviewing a non-serial bibliographic record for data content and content designation to ensure that it conforms to BIBCO bibliographic practices and agreed-upon conventions, and 2) adding identifying elements to the record to indicate the standards followed in the creation or review of the data. Authenticated records are then made available through contribution to one or more of the major bibliographic utilities.

BFM - Bibliographic file maintenance. BIBCO participants are required to identify bibliographic records in LC's catalog which should be changed as a result of a new or modified NACO record submitted in support of a BIBCO record and to notify their Coop Cat liaison of needed changes. LC staff will perform BFM on those bibliographic records.

BIBCO - The non-serial bibliographic record component of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco.html)

BIBCO Coordinator – The person within the Library of Congress Cooperative Cataloging Team responsible for coordinating the BIBCO Program nationally.

BIBCO Liaison – The person responsible for coordinating BIBCO activity at a particular institution, for reporting statistics to the Library of Congress, and for responding to inquiries from other BIBCO libraries about that institution's BIBCO records.

Cooperative Cataloging Council – predecessor of the PCC

Core - a minimum set of data elements which the PCC has agreed program records will meet. The standard can be used by any library. The core record standard was defined in 1994 by a Task Group appointed by the Cooperative Cataloging Council. Each format has its own set of minimum data elements that has been defined by the PCC Standing Committee on Standards in consultation with specific cataloging constituencies.

CPSO - Cataloging Policy and Support Office, LC (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/)

Dewey – Dewey Decimal Classification. One of the possible classification schemes for use in BIBCO records.

Integrating resource – A bibliographic resource that is added to or changed by means of updates that do not remain discrete and are integrated into the whole. Examples of integrating resources include updating loose-leafs and updating Web sites.

LC – Library of Congress.

LC Coop Team – Library of Congress Cooperative Cataloging Team, RCCD. The Team responsible for coordination of the BIBCO, NACO, and SACO components of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging.

LCC - Library of Congress Classification. One of the possible classification schemes for use in BIBCO records.

LCRIs or RIs – Library of Congress Rule Interpretations to AACR2. BIBCO participants are required to follow LCRIs in their authority and bibliographic records.

LCSH - Library of Congress Subject Headings. One of the possible schemes of subject headings required in BIBCO records.

MARC - Acronym for <u>MA</u>chine-<u>R</u>eadable <u>C</u>ataloging. It provides the mechanism by which computers exchange, use and interpret bibliographic and related information.
 (http://lcweb.loc.gov/marc/index.html)

MARC21 – The current version of MARC, adopted when the USMARC and CAN/MARC (Canadian MARC) formats were "harmonized" in 1997.

MeSH – Medical Subject Headings. Maintained by the National Library of Medicine. One of possible schemes of subject headings required in BIBCO records.

NACO - Name Authority Cooperative Project (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/naco.html)

NAF - National Authority File. Maintained by the Library of Congress and distributed through OCLC, RLIN, and the British Library. In RLIN, "NAF" is the Name Authority File and "SAF" is the Subject Authority File.

OCLC – Online Computer Library Center, Inc., one of the two major utilities serving as host to BIBCO records. (http://www.oclc.org/home/)

PCC - Program for Cooperative Cataloging (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/)

RCCD – Regional and Cooperative Cataloging Division, Library of Congress

RLG – Research Libraries Group, one of the two major utilities serving as host to BIBCO records (http://www.rlg.org/rlg.html)

RLIN – Research Library Information Network, now called the RLG Union Catalog.

SACO - Subject Authority Cooperative Program (http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/saco.html)

SCM - *Subject Cataloging Manual*. Issued in three sections by LC: *Subject Headings*, *Classification*, and *Shelflisting*.

B1   Record Content

B1.1   Identification of Program Records

BIBCO records can be identified by the presence of field 042 with the value "pcc". In addition, the Cataloging Source Code (008, byte 39) will have value "c," except in those cases where a Library of Congress record has been upgraded and it remains "blank." PCC Core records have an Encoding Level (Leader, byte 17) with value "4" and PCC Full records have an Encoding Level with value "blank."

B1.2   Leader, Directory, and Variable Control Fields (001, 003, 005, 007, 008)

The leader, directory, and variable control fields of BIBCO records should follow the guidelines articulated in the PCC Core standards, which are usually based on the *National Level Record* standard (http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/nlr/). There is no difference between the coding of the variable control fields for PCC Full and PCC Core records.

B1.3   Bibliographic Description

Bibliographic description is based on the latest edition of the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* and on related *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations*. BIBCO participants agree to follow the LCRIs for all records that they code as BIBCO. When a library's local needs dictate a practice that is not supported by AACR and the LCRIs, it has the option of not contributing the record as a BIBCO record or of modifying the content of the record for its local use only. The inclusion of specific required data elements in BIBCO records is based on PCC Full and Core standards.

**B1	Record Content**

**B1.1	Identification of Program Records**

BIBCO records can be identified by the presence of field 042 with the value "pcc". In addition, the Cataloging Source Code (008, byte 39) will have value "c," except in those cases where a Library of Congress record has been upgraded and it remains "blank." PCC Core records have an Encoding Level (Leader, byte 17) with value "4" and PCC Full records have an Encoding Level with value "blank."

**B1.2	Leader, Directory, and Variable Control Fields (001, 003, 005, 007, 008)**

The leader, directory, and variable control fields of BIBCO records should follow the guidelines articulated in the PCC Core standards, which are usually based on the *National Level Record* standard (http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/nlr/). There is no difference between the coding of the variable control fields for PCC Full and PCC Core records.

**B1.3	Bibliographic Description**

Bibliographic description is based on the latest edition of the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* and on related *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations*. BIBCO participants agree to follow the LCRIs for all records that they code as BIBCO. When a library's local needs dictate a practice that is not supported by AACR and the LCRIs, it has the option of not contributing the record as a BIBCO record or of modifying the content of the record for its local use only. The inclusion of specific required data elements in BIBCO records is based on PCC Full and Core standards.

B1.4 Authority control and headings

Authority control is the process of determining "the use of consistent names and terminology in the face of pseudonyms, changing names, changing subject terminology, and changing relationships between and among scholarly disciplines, corporate bodies and governmental agencies."[1] Authority control allows individual library users, through one search, to have a high degree of confidence that they have found everything by a particular author or about a particular bibliographic work or about a particular topic that is owned by or accessible through their library. Catalogers determine the predominant or most likely form of a name, title of a work, series, or a topic. They then create an authority record to establish the heading, document its use, and record the permutations or variant forms.

Catalogs under authority control save library users and researchers time. When there is an authority record for a particular name, title, series, or subject, a researcher who has searched under an alternative form will be redirected to the authoritative form. This redirection may be done manually by the researcher after reading a referral generated by the computer, or the online catalog may automatically redirect his search. It is the authority record structure that makes this possible.

Recognizing the value that authority control adds to any catalog, the founders of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging mandated that all headings on Program records would be under authority control and represented by Program-level authority records in shared resource files. This is why a library must first have achieved independent status within the NACO program before it can join BIBCO.

Prior to submitting bibliographic records coded as BIBCO (042=pcc, Encoding Level=blank or 4), all access points on the bibliographic record must be supported by Program-level authority records, with three exceptions:

1. Newly-proposed LC subject headings that have been submitted as SACO proposals may be entered on bibliographic records coded as BIBCO. Proposed headings are considered to be pre-approved in the absence of other communication from the LC Coop Team. If the Library of Congress rejects or modifies the proposed subject heading, the inputting library agrees to modify the bibliographic record in the databases to reflect the approved LCSH heading.

2. Series not yet established may be entered as untraced (490 0_) on BIBCO records that are coded as Core (Encoding Level=4) without a supporting Program-level authority record being created.

3. Even when the rules require the addition of a uniform title to a bibliographic record that is coded as BIBCO, it is not always necessary to create an authority record for the uniform titles (e.g., when there is no cross reference to be added, or no research has been performed)

B1.4.1   Names

BIBCO catalogers follow AACR2 and the LC Rule Interpretations when establishing a name heading. All personal, corporate, or conference names used as authors or subjects on BIBCO records must be represented by a Name Authority Record in the shared file. If a Program-level authority record has been established for a name, BIBCO catalogers will use the established form. If needed, they will modify the Name Authority Record (NAR), following the guidelines in the *NACO Participants' Manual.* If there is no NAR, BIBCO catalogers will research the heading and submit one, following the guidelines in the *NACO Participants' Manual.* Like all NACO participants, BIBCO catalogers are still expected to notify the Library of Congress when there is a variant form of a name in the LC catalog so that LC may perform bibliographic file maintenance. This requirement is expected to be discontinued once the LC catalog is capable of performing global changes of headings based on authority records.

B1.4.2   Uniform titles

BIBCO catalogers follow AACR2 and LC Rule Interpretations when establishing a uniform title heading. Sometimes Program-level authority records are not required for uniform titles, even though the rules require the uniform title (130/240) to be in the record.

An example of this is an instance where a title translated into another language is the same or would normalize to be the same as the title in the original language. According to the *NACO Participants' Manual*, catalogers are required to make uniform title authority records (according to *LC Descriptive Cataloging Manual Z1* p.2 of Intro) when:

(1)   a reference must be traced on that authority record; or,
(2)   special research done to establish that heading must be recorded (Note: In this context the LC manual Official Name Catalog is treated as a reference source; so searches in that catalog should be recorded in the authority record); or,
(3)   the heading is needed for a related work added or subject entry, and the work is not represented in the LC database either by a bibliographic record for the work itself (original or translation) or by an analytical added entry on another bibliographic record; or,
(4)   special information needs to be recorded, e.g., citation title for a law;

When in doubt about the need for a uniform title NAR, BIBCO catalogers should consult AACR2, LCRI, and the *NACO Participants' Manual*. If the doubt remains after having consulted these sources, please consult the LC Coop Team.

B1.4.3   Series

BIBCO catalogers follow AACR2 and LC Rule Interpretations when establishing the form of a series tracing.

It is not necessary to contribute series to NACO in order to join BIBCO; however, it is highly desirable. In order to maintain consistency in the presence and form of series access points in bibliographic records in shared databases, the PCC approved a Program-level tracing practice of

"trace." All traced series must be supported by a Program-level series authority record. Therefore, a library that does not contribute series authority records will not be able to contribute Full level bibliographic records containing series that are not already established in the shared international authority files.

BIBCO participants using the Core record standard(s) should transcribe all series as found on an item. They are exempt from creating series authority records for unestablished series and may code these series as 490 0 on BIBCO records. Untraced series on a Core record need not be supported by a Program-level authority record.

BIBCO participants contributing Program records must comply with the series policies and procedures as stated in the *LC Descriptive Cataloging Manual Z1* supplement to the MARC 21 Authority Format and the LCRIs. The *Descriptive Cataloging Manual (DCM) Z1* "yellow pages" 64X Section, dated May 2000, contains the LC/PCC policy on series and follows up with the detailed procedures for creating or modifying the 64X fields. This reflects the LC/PCC Program-level series treatment policy, which should be: "analyzed in full, traced, classified separately." It should be noted that LC or any other PCC library may vary from the default analysis or classification practice for reasons of local needs/preferences/resources. If LC or any other BIBCO library varies from the PCC default classification practice, the library may still code the analytic record as BIBCO even if it does not supply a "class separately" number. However, the library must still follow the "default tracing practice" and trace the series in the analytic record.

The Program-level tracing decision information is given in two fields in the SAR: field 645 (tracing) and, when appropriate, field 642 (form of number in added entry) to ensure consistent access points. The use of the MARC 21 organization code "DPCC" (for the Program for Cooperative Cataloging) in subfield $5 of those two fields indicates that the information applies at the national level. The cataloger is stating both fact and form: the fact that the series is numbered and the form in which that numbering should be recorded in the series access point in the bibliographic record. ***The "DPCC" code will <u>not</u> be given in subfield |5 in either field 644 (analysis) or field 646 (classification).*** There is no need to document those decisions at the national level in an SAR since the policy is stated in the 64X section of the yellow pages and since these fields are not related to the form of series access points as are the 642/645 fields.

However, a PCC participant has the option to include its own MARC 21 identification code in treatment fields (644, 645, 646) in SARs it creates to show that it is following the national default decisions or, by exception, is varying from those default decisions in whole or in part. *Examples:*

> 645$a t $5 DPCC
> **645$a n $5 WaU**   *(optional addition to show local variation from default decision to trace)*

> 645$a t $5 DPCC **$5 WaU** *(optional addition to show agreement with default decision)*

> **644$a f $5 WaU**   *(optional addition to show analysis decision)*
> 645$a t $5 DPCC

646$a s $5 WaU   *(optional addition to show classification decision)*

Likewise, a PCC participant has the option to add its local treatment decisions to any SAR created by LC or any other PCC participant *if another PCC participant's treatment decisions are not already in the SAR*. *Examples:*

Existing SAR	**Revisions NOT permitted shown in bold**	
644$a f $5 WaU	644$a f $5 WaU **$5 CLU**	*(additions not*
645$a t $5 DPCC	645$a t $5 DPCC	*permitted because*
646$a s $5 WaU	**645$a n $5 CLU**	*another library's code*
	646$a s $5 WaU **$5 CLU**	*is already in the*
		record)

Existing SAR	**Revisions permitted shown in bold**	
645$a t $5 DPCC	**644$a f $5 WaU**	*(additions permitted*
	645$a t $5 DPCC **$5 WaU**	*because no*
	646$a s $5 WaU	*other library's code is*
		in the record)

LC treatment decisions are not to be predicted by PCC participants. BIBCO participants who input records directly into LC's local system must always indicate LC treatment decisions in SARs (even if LC does not yet have an item) in addition to the Program-level tracing decision. They may omit or include their own treatment decisions, using their own MARC 21 organization codes.

BIBCO tracing practice

SAR already exists in the Program authority file

- If SAR was established before September 1989 and LC's 644 has value "f" and LC's 645 has value "n," do not trace the series; code the bibliographic record (either full or core) as a BIBCO record. Do not add the "DPCC" 642/645 fields to an existing SAR.

- If SAR other than one described in previous category has 645 value "t" with any subfield |5, trace the series and code the bibliographic record (either full or core) as a BIBCO record. Do not add the "DPCC" 642/645 fields to an existing SAR.

- If SAR has only LC's 644 of "n" and LC's 645 of "n," trace the series and code the bibliographic record (either full or core) as a BIBCO record. Do not add the "DPCC" 642/645 fields to an existing SAR.

- If SAR lacks 645 field, trace the series and code the bibliographic record (either full or core) as a BIBCO record. Do not add the "DPCC" 642/645 fields to an existing SAR.

SAR doesn't exist in the Program authority file

For a full-level bibliographic record:
- contribute an SAR (with "|5 DPCC" in 642 and 645 fields) to the national authority files, <u>and</u>
- trace the series in the analytic record.

For a core-level bibliographic record, <u>either</u>:
- contribute an SAR (with "|5 DPCC" in 642 and 645 fields) to the national authority file, <u>and</u>
- trace the series in the analytic record;

<u>or</u>:

- don't contribute an SAR to the Program authority file, <u>and</u>
- don't trace the series in the analytic record.

If a BIBCO participant chooses <u>not</u> to follow the guidelines stated above, the resulting analytic records should <u>not</u> be coded as BIBCO records.

There are several options for PCC participants when their local treatment decision is <u>not</u> to trace a series. Refer to: Frequently Asked Questions about Series (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/seriesfaq.html) on the BIBCO web page of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging website for treatment in cases:

A. If a BIBCO participant does not wish to trace a series and an SAR is not in the national authority file (NAF)
B. If a BIBCO participant does not wish to trace a series and there is a SAR extant in the NAF
C. If a non-BIBCO participant does not trace a series in its local catalog and a SAR is not in the NAF
D. If a non-BIBCO participant does not trace a series in its local catalog and an SAR is extant in the NAF

B1.4.4 Subject Headings

A library does not need to use one particular subject thesaurus or classification scheme in order to join BIBCO. BIBCO participants may utilize any classification or subject heading scheme assigned a code within the *MARC 21* format. The provision includes subject thesauri from any source (1) specifically identified in the format (e.g., fields 600-651, 2nd indicator 0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6)

or (2) included in the code list for relators, sources, description conventions and identified in 600-651, subfield $2. The Core record standard(s) defined by the PCC clearly state that a BIBCO record must, when appropriate for the material being cataloged, contain subject headings from a "recognized thesaurus" such as AAT, MeSH, LCSH, etc. Catalogers should consult the printed and online documentation available for the different schemes when creating or upgrading bibliographic records.

It is expected that catalogers contributing BIBCO records have sufficient knowledge of the subject or language of the materials being cataloged to be able to provide adequate subject analysis. When in doubt about the content analysis because of insufficient subject or language expertise, the cataloger should not contribute the record as BIBCO.

Catalogers submitting BIBCO records are always expected to perform appropriate content analysis and to assign headings that accurately describe the content of the work being cataloged, whether the records are at the Core or Full level. The Core standards state that, when appropriate, catalogers should assign "at least one or two" subject headings. Core standards do not restrict the number of subject headings that may be assigned, nor do they sanction the use of broad, general headings. Subject headings should always be assigned at the appropriate level of specificity. The difference in subject analysis between Full and Core BIBCO records is that, when doing a Core record, catalogers may limit their subject analysis to the primary emphasis of the work and disregard secondary aspects. The level of subject analysis is a local decision in the application of the Core standard.

B1.4.4.1 LCSH

Those participants using LCSH are expected to adhere to the principles and policies for its application and formulation as stated in current documentation issued by LC. In particular, BIBCO catalogers following LCSH and contributing Core records, should read instruction sheet H170: Core Level Records of the *Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings.* The instruction sheet provides general guidelines for assigning subject headings to core level records for all types of materials, as well as special instructions for JACKPHY catalog records and music recordings.

In general, catalogers contributing BIBCO Core records with LC subject headings are instructed in the *Subject Cataloging Manual : Subject Headings* to assign at least one or two headings from the subject authority file and/or the name authority file to represent the primary subject and/or form of the work at the appropriate level of specificity. They are to assign headings to provide access to the essential subject focus of the work which would normally correspond to the meaning of the assigned class number. Concentrating on the primary or essential subject focus of a work means that secondary or tertiary subjects will normally not be represented in the assigned subject headings of a Core level record, even if they constitute at least 20% of an item (cf. H 180 sec. 1). Multiple headings may be needed to represent a compound or multi-element topic for which a single heading neither exists nor can practically be constructed or established (cf. H 180 sec. 10). Multiple headings may also be needed in situations where reciprocal headings are used, for example, [place 1]–Foreign relations–[place 2] and [place 2]–Foreign relations–[place 1], or where a standard array of headings is prescribed, for example, on biographies (cf. H 1330). For the headings that are assigned, catalogers are instructed to follow the conventions applied to Full level cataloging. For example, where appropriate, they are to subdivide main headings by topical,

geographic, chronological, and/or form subdivisions to bring out those aspects of the primary subject (cf. H 180 sec. 16). They are instructed to assign headings at the level of specificity appropriate to the work (cf. H 180 sec. 4).

BIBCO catalogers are expected to establish new headings for discrete topics and named entities as they are needed. The process for submitting new or changed LCSH proposals is documented online via the Web at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/sacohelp.html and in the *SACO Participants' Manual*. Catalogers not wishing to submit a SACO proposal for a new discrete topic or entity should not contribute the bibliographic record in question as a BIBCO record.

B1.4.4.2   MeSH

The Medical Subject Headings comprise the National Library of Medicine's controlled vocabulary used for indexing articles, for cataloging books and other materials, and for searching MeSH-indexed databases. The Cataloging Practices section of the *Annotated Alphabetic MeSH* is available online via the Web at: http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/catpractices.html to provide guidance to catalogers using MeSH in bibliographic records. The same standards for subject analysis for Full and Core BIBCO records applies regardless of the thesaurus being used.

NLM accepts proposals for new terms in the thesaurus. The form for submitting suggestions is available on the Web at: http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/meshsugg.html

[1]   Susan K. Martin, "Authority Control: Unnecessary Detail or Needed Support," *Library Issues: Briefings for Faculty and Administrators* 2 (January 1982): 2.

Also consulted: Doris Hargrett Clack, Authority Control: Principles, Applications, and Instructions, Chicago: American Library Association, 1990.

B1.4   Authority control and headings

Authority control is the process of determining "the use of consistent names and terminology in the face of pseudonyms, changing names, changing subject terminology, and changing relationships between and among scholarly disciplines, corporate bodies and governmental agencies."[1] It enables users to have a high degree of confidence that they have found everything by a particular author or about a particular bibliographic work or topic that is owned by or accessible through their library. Catalogers determine the predominant or most likely form of a name, title of a work, series, or a topic. They then create an authority record to establish the heading, document its use, and record the permutations or variant forms.

Catalogs under authority control save library users and researchers time. When there is an authority record for a particular name, title, series, or subject, a researcher who has searched under an alternative form will be redirected to the authoritative form. The redirection may be done manually by researchers after reading a referral generated by the computer, or the online catalog may automatically redirect their searches. It is the authority record structure that makes search redirection possible.

Recognizing the value that authority control adds to any catalog, the founders of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging mandated that all headings on Program records would be under authority control and represented by Program-level authority records in shared resource files. This is why a library must first have achieved independent status within the NACO program before it can join BIBCO.

Prior to submitting bibliographic records coded as BIBCO (042=pcc, Encoding Level=blank or 4), all access points on the bibliographic record must be supported by Program-level authority records, with three exceptions:

1. Newly-proposed LC subject headings that have been submitted as SACO proposals may be entered on bibliographic records coded as BIBCO. Proposed headings are considered to be pre-approved in the absence of other communication from the LC Coop Team. If the Library of Congress rejects or modifies the proposed subject heading, the inputting library agrees to modify the bibliographic record in the databases to reflect the approved LCSH heading.

2. Series not yet established may be entered as untraced (490 0_) on BIBCO records that are coded as PCC Core (Encoding Level=4) without a supporting Program-level authority record being created.

3. Even when the rules require the addition of a uniform title to a bibliographic record that is coded as BIBCO, it is not always necessary to create an authority record for the uniform titles (e.g., when there is no cross reference to be added, or no research has been performed)

B1.4.1　　　Names

BIBCO catalogers follow AACR and the *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations* when establishing a name heading. All personal, corporate, or conference names used as authors or subjects on BIBCO records must be represented by a Name Authority Record (NAR) in the shared file. If a Program-level authority record has been established for a name, BIBCO catalogers will use the established form. If needed, they will modify the NAR, following the guidelines in the *NACO Participants' Manual.* If there is no NAR, BIBCO catalogers will research the heading and submit one, as directed in the *NACO Participants' Manual.* Like all NACO participants, BIBCO catalogers are still expected to notify the Library of Congress when there is a variant form of a name in the LC catalog so that LC may perform bibliographic file maintenance. This requirement is expected to be discontinued once the LC catalog is capable of performing global changes of headings based on authority records.

B1.4.2　　　Uniform titles

BIBCO catalogers follow AACR and *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations* when establishing a uniform title heading. Sometimes Program-level authority records are not required for uniform titles, even though the rules require the uniform title (130/240) to be in the record.

An example of this is when a title translated into another language is the same or would normalize to be the same as the title in the original language. According to the *NACO Participants' Manual*, catalogers are required to make uniform title authority records (according to *LC Descriptive Cataloging Manual Z1* p.2 of Intro) when:

(1)　　　a reference must be traced on that authority record; or,
(2)　　　special research done to establish that heading must be recorded (Note: In this context the LC manual Official Name Catalog is treated as a reference source; so searches in that catalog should be recorded in the authority record); or,
(3)　　　the heading is needed for a related work added or subject entry, and the work is not represented in the LC database either by a bibliographic record for the work itself (original or translation) or by an analytical added entry on another bibliographic record; or,
(4)　　　special information needs to be recorded, e.g., citation title for a law;

When in doubt about the need for a uniform title NAR, BIBCO catalogers should consult AACR, LCRIs, and the *NACO Participants' Manual*. If still in doubt after having consulted these sources, catalogers should consult the LC Coop Team.

B1.4.3　　　Series

BIBCO catalogers follow AACR and *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations* when establishing the form of a series tracing.

While it is not necessary for a library to contribute series headings to NACO in order to join BIBCO, it is highly desirable. In order to maintain consistency with series access points in bibliographic records in shared databases, the PCC approved a Program-level tracing practice of

"trace." All traced series must be supported by a Program-level series authority record. Therefore, a library that does not contribute series authority records will not be able to contribute PCC Full level bibliographic records containing series that are not already established in the shared international authority files.

BIBCO participants using the PCC Core record standard(s) should transcribe all series as found on an item. They are exempt from creating series authority records for unestablished series and may code these series as 490 0 on BIBCO records. Untraced series on a PCC Core record need not be supported by a Program-level authority record.

BIBCO participants contributing Program records must comply with the series policies and procedures as stated in the *LC Descriptive Cataloging Manual Z1* supplement to the MARC 21 Authority Format and the LCRIs. The *Descriptive Cataloging Manual (DCM) Z1* "yellow pages" 64X Section, dated May 2000, contains the LC/PCC policy on series and follows up with the detailed procedures for creating or modifying the 64X fields. This reflects the LC/PCC Program-level series treatment policy, which should be: "analyzed in full, traced, classified separately."

It should be noted that any PCC library may vary from the default analysis or classification practice for reasons of local needs/preferences/resources. When varying from the PCC default classification practice, the library may code the analytic record as BIBCO even if it does not supply a "class separately" number. However, it must still follow the "default tracing practice" and trace the series in the analytic record.

The Program-level tracing decision information is given in two fields in the SAR: field 645 (tracing) and, when appropriate, field 642 (form of number in added entry) to ensure consistent access points. The use of the MARC 21 organization code "DPCC" (for the Program for Cooperative Cataloging) in subfield $5 of those two fields indicates that the information applies at the national level. ***The "DPCC" code may <u>not</u> be given in subfield |5 in either field 644 (analysis) or field 646 (classification).*** 644 and 646 decisions are not documented at the national level in an SAR. The policy is stated in the 64X section of the yellow pages and since these fields are not related to the form of series access points as are the 642/645 fields.

A PCC participant has the option to include its own MARC 21 identification code in treatment fields (644, 645, 646) in SARs it creates to show that it is following the national default decisions or, by exception, is varying from those default decisions in whole or in part. *Examples:*

> 645$a t $5 DPCC
> **645$a n $5 WaU**   *(optional addition to show local variation from default decision to trace)*

> 645$a t $5 DPCC **$5 WaU** *(optional addition to show agreement with default decision)*

> **644$a f $5 WaU**   *(optional addition to show analysis decision)*
> 645$a t $5 DPCC
> **646$a s $5 WaU**   *(optional addition to show classification decision)*

Likewise, a PCC participant has the option to add its local treatment decisions to any SAR created by LC or any other PCC participant *if another PCC participant's treatment decisions are not already in the SAR*. *Examples:*

Existing SAR	**Revisions NOT permitted shown in bold**	
644$a f $5 WaU	644$a f $5 WaU **$5 CLU**	*(additions not*
645$a t $5 DPCC	645$a t $5 DPCC	*permitted because*
646$a s $5 WaU	**645$a n $5 CLU**	*another library's code*
	646$a s $5 WaU **$5 CLU**	*is already in the*
		record)

Existing SAR	**Revisions permitted shown in bold**	
645$a t $5 DPCC	**644$a f $5 WaU**	*(additions permitted*
	645$a t $5 DPCC **$5 WaU**	*because no*
	646$a s $5 WaU	*other library's code is*
		in the record)

BIBCO participants should not predict LC treatment decisions. Participants who input records directly into LC's local system must always indicate LC treatment decisions in SARs (even if LC does not yet have an item) in addition to the Program-level tracing decision. They may omit or include their own treatment decisions, using their own MARC 21 organization codes.

BIBCO tracing practice

SAR already exists in the Program authority file

- If SAR was established before September 1989 and LC's 644 has value "f" and LC's 645 has value "n," do not trace the series; code the bibliographic record (either full or core) as a BIBCO record. Do not add the "DPCC" 642/645 fields to an existing SAR.

- If SAR other than one described in previous category has 645 value "t" with any subfield |5, trace the series and code the bibliographic record (either full or core) as a BIBCO record. Do not add the "DPCC" 642/645 fields to an existing SAR.

- If SAR has only LC's 644 of "n" and LC's 645 of "n," trace the series and code the bibliographic record (either full or core) as a BIBCO record. Do not add the "DPCC" 642/645 fields to an existing SAR.

- If SAR lacks 645 field, trace the series and code the bibliographic record (either full or core) as a BIBCO record. Do not add the "DPCC" 642/645 fields to an existing SAR.

SAR does not exist in the Program authority file

> For a full-level bibliographic record:
> - contribute an SAR (with "|5 DPCC" in 642 and 645 fields) to the national authority files, <u>and</u>
> - trace the series in the analytic record.

> For a core-level bibliographic record, <u>either</u>:
> - contribute an SAR (with "|5 DPCC" in 642 and 645 fields) to the national authority file, <u>and</u>
> - trace the series in the analytic record;
>
>   <u>or:</u>
>
> - don't contribute an SAR to the Program authority file, <u>and</u>
> - don't trace the series in the analytic record.

If a BIBCO library chooses <u>not</u> to follow the guidelines stated above, the resulting analytic records should <u>not</u> be coded as BIBCO records. Alternatively, the library may contribute the records as BIBCO and modify them for their local files.

B1.4.4   Subject Headings

A library does not need to use one particular subject thesaurus or classification scheme in order to join BIBCO. BIBCO participants may utilize any classification or subject heading scheme assigned a code within the *MARC 21* format. The provision includes subject thesauri from any source (1) specifically identified in the format (e.g., fields 600-651, 2nd indicator 0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6) or (2) included in the code list for relators, sources, description conventions and identified in 600-651, subfield $2. The PCC Core record standard(s) clearly state that a BIBCO record must contain subject headings from a "recognized thesaurus" (e.g., AAT, MeSH, LCSH) when subject analysis is appropriate. Catalogers should consult the printed and online documentation available for the different schemes when creating or upgrading bibliographic records.

It is expected that catalogers contributing BIBCO records will have sufficient knowledge of the subject or language of the materials being cataloged to be able to provide adequate subject analysis. When in doubt about the content analysis because of insufficient subject or language expertise, the cataloger should not contribute the record as BIBCO.

Catalogers submitting BIBCO records are always expected to perform appropriate content analysis and to assign headings that accurately describe the content of the work being cataloged, whether the records are at the PCC Core or PCC Full level. The PCC Core standards state that, when appropriate, catalogers should assign "at least one or two" subject headings. Core standards do not restrict the number of subject headings that may be assigned, nor do they sanction the use

of broad, general headings in place of specific ones. Catalogers are expected to use judgment in assessing each item and, if appropriate, assign a complement of headings that provides access to the primary/essential subject and/or form of the work (as opposed to secondary or tertiary aspects) at the appropriate level of specificity. Catalogers are expected to assign such headings from an established thesaurus or subject heading system and/or an appropriate genre/form list recognized by the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. In focusing on the primary subject aspect, they should follow the conventions of the particular subject heading system being used, including instances in which paired or related headings are needed to represent fully the primary subject aspect.

The difference in subject analysis between PCC Full and PCC Core records is that, when doing a PCC Core record, catalogers may limit their subject analysis to the primary emphasis of the work and disregard secondary or tertiary aspects.

B1.4.4.1   LCSH

Those participants using LCSH are expected to adhere to the principles and policies for its application and formulation as stated in current documentation issued by LC. In particular, BIBCO catalogers following LCSH and contributing PCC Core records, should read instruction sheet H170: Core Level Records of the *Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings* (SCM). The instruction sheet provides general guidelines for assigning subject headings to core level records for all types of materials, as well as special instructions for JACKPHY catalog records and music recordings.

In general, catalogers contributing PCC Core records with LC subject headings are instructed in the SCM to assign at least one or two headings from the subject authority file and/or the name authority file to represent the primary subject and/or form of the work at the appropriate level of specificity. They are to assign headings to provide access to the essential subject focus of the work which would normally correspond to the meaning of the assigned class number. Concentrating on the primary or essential subject focus of a work means that secondary or tertiary subjects will normally not be represented in the assigned subject headings of a PCC Core level record, even if they constitute at least 20% of an item (cf. H 180 sec. 1). Multiple headings may be needed to represent a compound or multi-element topic for which a single heading neither exists nor can practically be constructed or established (cf. H 180 sec. 10). Multiple headings may also be needed in situations where reciprocal headings are used, for example, [place 1]–Foreign relations–[place 2] and [place 2]–Foreign relations–[place 1], or where a standard array of headings is prescribed, for example, on biographies (cf. H 1330). For the headings that are assigned, catalogers are instructed to follow the conventions applied to PCC Full level cataloging. For example, where appropriate, they are to subdivide main headings by topical, geographic, chronological, and/or form subdivisions to bring out those aspects of the primary subject (cf. H 180 sec. 16). They are instructed to assign headings at the level of specificity appropriate to the work (cf. H 180 sec. 4).

BIBCO catalogers are expected to establish new headings for discrete topics and named entities as they are needed. The process for submitting new or changed LCSH proposals is documented online via the Web at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/sacohelp.html and in the *SACO Participants' Manual*. Catalogers not wishing to submit a SACO proposal for a new discrete topic or entity should not contribute the bibliographic record in question as a BIBCO record.

B1.4.4.2   MeSH

The Medical Subject Headings comprise the National Library of Medicine's controlled vocabulary used for indexing articles, for cataloging books and other materials, and for searching MeSH-indexed databases. The Cataloging Practices section of the *Annotated Alphabetic MeSH* is available online via the Web at: http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/catpractices.html to provide guidance to catalogers using MeSH in bibliographic records. The same standards for subject analysis for PCC Full and PCC Core records applies regardless of the thesaurus being used.

NLM accepts proposals for new terms in the thesaurus. The form for submitting suggestions is available on the Web at: http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/meshsugg.html

[1]   Susan K. Martin, "Authority Control: Unnecessary Detail or Needed Support," *Library Issues: Briefings for Faculty and Administrators* 2 (January 1982): 2.

Also consulted: Doris Hargrett Clack, Authority Control: Principles, Applications, and Instructions, Chicago: American Library Association, 1990.

B1.5   Classification

The purpose of including classification numbers in BIBCO records is to provide classified access and to provide the basis for building a call number through one of the classification systems supported by MARC21. Any classification number provided should aim to be in a form that is most useful to the widest number of potential users of that classification system.

B1.5.1   Overview

It is not necessary to use LC classification in order to contribute BIBCO records. It is only necessary that, when the standards for a particular format require it, a classification number from a scheme assigned a code within the MARC21 formats be included in the record. The provision includes classification systems from any source (1) specifically identified in the format (e.g., fields 050, 060, 070, 080, 082, 084, 086) or (2) included in the code list for relators, sources, description conventions.[1]

Some classification systems distinguish between the general and the particular. Data that relate to the general make it possible to group items of similar intellectual content (classification number). Data that relate to the particular make it possible to individualize items and subarrange them within a group (e.g., author Cutter, work Cutter, etc.). In applying such systems to BIBCO records, only a classification number is required. BIBCO libraries always have the option of supplying a full call number (including Cutters relating to shelf location), but it is not a Program requirement. What constitutes a classification number is determined by the nature of the classification system and the agency authorized to develop and maintain it. To the extent practicable, BIBCO libraries are expected to supply a classification number according to the current practice specified by the authoritative agency responsible for the development and maintenance of the classification system. A BIBCO library is only responsible for a classification number from the same scheme that it uses. If a classification number from another scheme appears in a record that a BIBCO institution upgrades as a BIBCO record, BIBCO libraries should retain the other number in the record.

Individual Core standards specify when a classification number is required. These same requirements apply also for records created in those formats at the Full level. Optionally, a classification number or call number may be supplied in records for materials in which the standard does not require such a number. If a library does not normally, for its local use, classify materials for which a BIBCO standard requires a classification number, the library may either supply one in particular cases or not contribute the record as a BIBCO record.

A classification number is required on BIBCO records for books and printed music. Classification numbers are optional on records for collections, computer files, rare books, graphic materials, moving image materials, and music and non-music sound recordings.

B1.5.2   Library of Congress Classification (LCC)

BIBCO libraries using Library of Congress Classification (LCC) should assign a classification number that adheres to LC practice and that includes the data that represent the topic (what the work is about). Input the LCC number in field 050 and use value "blank" (no information

provided) in the first indicator position and value "4" (assigned by agency other than LC) in the second indicator position. Setting the first indicator to "blank" prevents the need to determine if LC holds the item and improves the efficiency of supplying a classification number.

In OCLC, when upgrading an LC-MLC bibliographic record to include a classification number, BIBCO libraries should use value "1" (not in LC/not shelved under that number in LC) in the first indicator position of the 050.

BIBCO libraries may browse the online shelflist to assist in assigning an LC classification number to bibliographic records they create or update. However, libraries using LCC are expected to check the classification schedules to assure that an assigned classification number is current. By policy, LC does not routinely reclassify obsolete call numbers if the numbers were correct when originally assigned and there are many obsolete numbers in the LC shelflist.

Only subfield $a is required for both a Full and a Core record. It is defined in the MARC 21 bibliographic format as the :classification number", an authoritative-agency data element. Such data may include topical Cutters, work Cutters, artist numbers, or geographic Cutters, depending on the particular classification schedule. If the Cutter is printed in the schedules, that exact cutter must be used in the 050 subfield $a. Cutter numbers for authors, musicians, and artists are generally not printed in the LC classification schedules and need not be established by LC in order to be used in a BIBCO record. BIBCO catalogers may formulate a number after checking the LC online shelflist and assign it to a BIBCO record (042 = pcc) without submitting a classification proposal. Other examples of types of "unprinted Cutter numbers" include personal, corporate and geographic names, names of languages (when a topic is subarranged by language), and titles of individual works, except for literary works from early periods up to 1500.

Subfield $b is optional. It is defined in the MARC 21 bibliographic format as an "item number" and refers to the *LC Subject Cataloging Manual : Shelflisting* in which LC defines the elements that go into a subfield $b of the 050 as: "A book number: an alpha-numeric device appended to a class number to arrange material on the same subject in a specified order, usually alphabetically by author." The shelflisting manual also refers to the subfield $b as an "author number" which may be why catalogers sometimes get confused when discussing literary author numbers which are contained in the subfield $a.

If a BIBCO library deliberately varies from LC practice and assigns non-standard classification numbers, topical Cutter numbers or literary Cutter numbers, etc. for its local catalog, it may do one of the following:

> 1)   not submit the record as a BIBCO record;

> 2)   if the input system they are using supports a local call number field (090), input the variant number in that field, supply in field 050 a classification number that reflects LC practice, and submit the record as a BIBCO record.

B1.5.2.1   New Classification Numbers (LCC)

The Library of Congress accepts proposals for new classification numbers. Instructions for submission are available on the Web at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/classification.html. The SACO Participants' Manual also found on the SACO home page, provides many examples and offers guidance in proposing classification numbers. Catalogers should refer to the *LC Subject Cataloging Manual (SCM): Classification, F 50,* for a thorough explanation of the classification proposal process and instructions for completing the form. For those classification proposals that appear to involve major or complex development, it is advisable to discuss the development with the LC Coop Team liaison or to send an explanatory email message with the proposal.

BIBCO catalogers may formulate a LC number based on their knowledge of the schedules, etc., assign the number to their bibliographic record, code the record 042=pcc, and then submit a classification proposal with the caveat that number may be changed as it goes through the classification editorial process. If LC changes the classification number proposed by the BIBCO library, the number should be changed on the record in the utility. Local policies should be followed regarding BFM in local databases.

B1.5.2.2   Literary Author Numbers (LCC)

BIBCO libraries using LCC must use LC author cutters (i.e., all cutters that can be considered to be part of the actual classification number (subfield $a) and not specific to the edition of a work that is in hand (subfield $b)) when those have been established by LC.

When using a new literary author Cutter or number that has not yet been established by LC, BIBCO libraries are encouraged, but not required, to submit the number to the Library of Congress for verification. For those libraries that prefer to have the author number or Cutter in their BIBCO records established by the Library of Congress, LC has continued the practice of establishing literary author numbers at the request of PCC partner institutions.

A BIBCO institution may send an e-mail or fax request for a literary author cutter or number to the LC Cooperative Cataloging Team. The library may also use the web form for 053 requests available at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/053/053prop.html. Upon receipt of the request, a member of the LC COOP Team reserves a literary author number for each author, as requested. The LC Coop Team reports back to the requestor to indicate the exact number reserved within the LC files. The PCC participant then records that number in the 053 (2nd indicator "0") of the name authority record via the NACO program. This procedure assures that authorized literary author numbers will be available to all users of LC's bibliographic products for application in their catalogs.

NACO libraries may use LC's online shelflist via the Web for purposes of formulating a LC classification number when requesting an 053 for inclusion in a name authority record. BIBCO libraries may browse the online shelflist to assist in assigning an LC Classification number to bibliographic records they create or update. More details are available at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/litauthno.html

B1.5.2.3   New Topical, Geographic or Artist Cutters (LCC)

BIBCO libraries must use LC artist, geographic, and topical cutters (i.e., all cutters that can be considered to be part of the actual classification number (subfield $a) and not specific to the edition of a work that is in hand (subfield $b)) when those have been established by LC. If LC has not established such cutters, then BIBCO libraries may assign one, conforming to the appropriate practice for the schedule in use, and input it in the 050 (second indicator "4"). LC may change the cutter later if they need to deal with the particular entity it represents. There is no expectation, however, that the BIBCO library will monitor this and later revise their earlier BIBCO record so that the cutter conforms to LC's. However, all future BIBCO records must use the newly-established LC cutter.

Unlike the optional verification process for literary author cutters or numbers, there is no process for a BIBCO library to have LC verify new artist numbers or Cutters or new geographic cutters. However, new topical cutters may be submitted as part of a SACO proposal, if appropriate.

B1.5.2.4   Bibliography numbers (LCC)

LC recognizes that it is not practical for all libraries to follow LC classification policies in all respects. LC classes topical bibliographies in specific topical numbers in Class Z and provides an alternative number for those same topics from other classes. This is performed as a service of the national cataloging agency.

BIBCO libraries may choose to classify a PCC designated bibliographic record either in an established number for the topic in Z or in a number for that topic in other LCC classes. To improve the efficacy of this procedure, BIBCO libraries are asked not to supply an alternative number in either case.

B1.5.2.5   Series Classified Together

The BIBCO policy on series analysis and classification practice allows for BIBCO libraries to vary from the LC decision with respect to both these procedures (Cf. DCM Z1, 64X section; see also: Series FAQ). This means that a BIBCO library may choose to follow LC practice or choose to analyze and classify separately a BIBCO designated record.

When assigning an individual classification number, BIBCO libraries are asked not to supply the collected set number in the bibliographic record along with the individual number.

B1.5.3   Dewey Decimal Classification

The Dewey Decimal Classification system (DDC) is a general knowledge organization tool that is continuously revised to keep pace with knowledge. The system was conceived by Melvil Dewey in 1873 and first published in1876. The DDC is published by Forest Press, which in 1988 became a division of OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc. It is the most widely used library classification system in the world, used in more than 135 countries.

BIBCO libraries using Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) should assign a classification number using the current, full edition of the DDC appropriate to the specificity of the material in hand. Input the number in field 082 and use value "4" (assigned by agency other than LC) in the second indicator position. If a BIBCO library employs a number suggested as an option in the DDC, or a non-standard DDC number for its local catalog, it may do one of the following:

    1)   not submit the record as a BIBCO record;

    2)   if the input system they are using supports a local call number field (092), input the variant number in that field, supply in field 082 a classification number that reflects standard DDC practice, and submit the record as a BIBCO record.

The Dewey Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee (EPC), a ten-member international board whose main function is to advise the editors and OCLC Forest Press on matters relating to changes, innovations, and the general development of the Classification, accepts proposals for additions or changes to the DDC. Information about the EPC is available on the Web at: http://www.oclc.org/dewey/news/epc/index.htm

B1.5.4   **National Library of Medicine Classification**

The National Library of Medicine Classification system covers the field of medicine and related sciences. The scheme is intended to be used for the arrangement of all library materials, regardless of format. Designed as a broad classification, it is suitable for both large and small library collections and may be adapted to handle specialized collections of any size. It is patterned after the Library of Congress Classification and utilizes schedules QS-QZ and W-WZ that have been permanently excluded from LCC. It is intended to be used with the LCC schedules which supplement *NLM Classification* for subjects bordering on medicine and for general reference materials. The LCC schedules for Human Anatomy (QM), Microbiology (QR), and Medicine (R) are not used at all by the National Library of Medicine since they overlap the *NLM Classification*.

BIBCO Libraries using the National Library of Medicine Classification should assign a classification number using the current, full edition of the *NLM Classification* appropriate to the specificity of the material in hand and following the classification practices described in that tool. Input the number in field 060 and use value "4" (assigned by agency other than NLM) in the second indicator position. If a BIBCO library employs a variant number, the variant number should be input in a local call number field.

The National Library of Medicine accepts proposals for new classification numbers. Suggestions should be addressed to the Head, Cataloging Section, National Library of Medicine, 8600 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, Maryland 20894.

B1.5   **Classification**

Any classification number provided in a BIBCO record should aim to be in a form that is most useful to the widest number of potential users of that classification system.

B1.5.1   **Overview**

It is not necessary to use LC classification in order to contribute BIBCO records. It is only necessary that a classification number from a scheme assigned a code within the MARC 21 formats be included in the record when the standards for a particular format require it. The provision includes classification systems from any source (1) specifically identified in the format (e.g., fields 050, 060, 070, 080, 082, 084, 086) or (2) included in the code list for relators, sources, description conventions.[1]

Some classification systems distinguish between the general and the particular. Data that relate to the general make it possible to group items of similar intellectual content (classification number). Data that relate to the particular make it possible to individualize items and subarrange them within a group (e.g., author Cutter, work Cutter, etc.). In applying such systems to BIBCO records, only a classification number is required. BIBCO libraries always have the option of supplying a full call number (including Cutters relating to shelf location), but it is not a Program requirement. What constitutes a classification number is determined by the nature of the classification system and the agency authorized to develop and maintain it. To the extent practicable, BIBCO libraries are expected to supply a classification number according to the current practice specified by the authoritative agency responsible for the development and maintenance of the classification system. A BIBCO library is only responsible for a classification number from the same scheme that it uses. If a classification number from another scheme appears in a record that a BIBCO institution upgrades as a BIBCO record, BIBCO libraries should retain the other number in the record.

Individual PCC Core standards specify when a classification number is required. These same requirements apply also for records created in those formats at the PCC Full level. Optionally, a classification number or call number may be supplied in records for materials in which the standard does not require such a number. If a library does not normally classify materials for which a BIBCO standard requires a classification number, the library may either supply one in particular cases or not contribute the record as a BIBCO record.

A classification number is required on BIBCO records for books and printed music. Classification numbers are optional on records for collections, computer files, rare books, graphic materials, moving image materials, and music and non-music sound recordings.

B1.5.2   **Library of Congress Classification (LCC)**

BIBCO libraries using Library of Congress Classification (LCC) should assign a classification number that adheres to LC practice and that includes the data that represent the topic (what the work is about). Input the LCC number in field 050 and use value "blank" (no information provided) in the first indicator position and value "4" (assigned by agency other than LC) in the

second indicator position. Setting the first indicator to "blank" prevents the need to determine if LC holds the item and improves the efficiency of supplying a classification number.

In OCLC, when upgrading an LC-MLC bibliographic record to include a classification number, BIBCO libraries should use value "1" (not in LC/not shelved under that number in LC) in the first indicator position of the 050.

BIBCO libraries may browse the online shelflist to assist in assigning an LC classification number to bibliographic records they create or update. However, libraries using LCC are expected to check the classification schedules to assure that an assigned classification number is current. By policy, LC does not routinely reclassify obsolete call numbers if the numbers were correct when originally assigned and there are many obsolete numbers in the LC shelflist.

Only subfield $a is required for both a PCC Full and a PCC Core record. Subfield $a is defined in the MARC 21 bibliographic format as the "classification number", an authoritative-agency data element. Such data may include topical Cutters, work Cutters, artist numbers, or geographic Cutters, depending on the particular classification schedule. If the Cutter is printed in the schedules, that exact Cutter must be used in the 050 subfield $a. Cutter numbers for authors, musicians, and artists are generally not printed in the LC classification schedules and need not be established by LC in order to be used in a BIBCO record. BIBCO catalogers may formulate a number after checking the LC online shelflist and assign it to a BIBCO record (042 = pcc) without submitting a classification proposal. Other examples of types of "unprinted Cutter numbers" include personal, corporate and geographic names, names of languages (when a topic is subarranged by language), and titles of individual works, except for literary works from early periods up to 1500.

Subfield $b is optional. Subfield $b is defined in the MARC 21 bibliographic format as an "item number" and refers to the *LC Subject Cataloging Manual : Shelflisting* in which LC defines the elements that go into a subfield $b of the 050 as: "A book number: an alpha-numeric device appended to a class number to arrange material on the same subject in a specified order, usually alphabetically by author." The shelflisting manual also refers to the subfield $b as an "author number" which may be why catalogers sometimes get confused when discussing literary author numbers which are contained in the subfield $a.

If a BIBCO library deliberately varies from LC practice and assigns non-standard classification numbers, topical Cutter numbers or literary Cutter numbers, etc. for its local catalog, it may do one of the following:

> 1)   not submit the record as a BIBCO record;
>
> 2)   if the input system they are using supports a local call number field (090), input the variant number in that field, supply in field 050 a classification number that reflects LC practice, and submit the record as a BIBCO record.

B1.5.2.1 New Classification Numbers (LCC)

The Library of Congress accepts proposals for new classification numbers. Instructions for submission are available on the Web at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/classification.html. The SACO Participants' Manual also found on the SACO home page, provides many examples and offers guidance in proposing classification numbers. Catalogers should refer to the *LC Subject Cataloging Manual (SCM): Classification, F 50,* for a thorough explanation of the classification proposal process and instructions for completing the form. For those classification proposals that appear to involve major or complex development, it is advisable to discuss the development with the LC Coop Team liaison or to send an explanatory email message with the proposal.

BIBCO catalogers may formulate a LC number based on their knowledge of the schedules, etc., assign the number to their bibliographic record, code the record 042=pcc, and then submit a classification proposal with the caveat that number may be changed as it goes through the classification editorial process. If LC changes the classification number proposed by the BIBCO library, the number should be changed on the record in the utility. Local policies should be followed regarding BFM in local databases.

B1.5.2.2 Literary Author Numbers (LCC)

BIBCO libraries using LCC must use LC author Cutters (i.e., all Cutters that can be considered to be part of the actual classification number (subfield $a) and not specific to the edition of a work that is in hand (subfield $b)) when those have been established by LC.

When using a new literary author Cutter or number that has not yet been established by LC, BIBCO libraries are encouraged, but not required, to submit the number to the Library of Congress for verification. For those libraries that prefer to have the author number or Cutter in their BIBCO records established by the Library of Congress, LC has continued the practice of establishing literary author numbers at the request of PCC partner institutions.

A BIBCO institution may send an e-mail or fax request for a literary author Cutter or number to the LC Cooperative Cataloging Team. The library may also use the web form for 053 requests available at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/053/053prop.html. Upon receipt of the request, a member of the LC COOP Team reserves a literary author number for each author, as requested. The LC Coop Team reports back to the requestor to indicate the exact number reserved within the LC files. The PCC participant then records that number in the 053 (2nd indicator "0") of the name authority record via the NACO program. This procedure assures that authorized literary author numbers will be available to all users of LC's bibliographic products for application in their catalogs.

NACO libraries may use LC's online shelflist via the Web for purposes of formulating a LC classification number when requesting an 053 for inclusion in a name authority record. BIBCO libraries may browse the online shelflist to assist in assigning an LC Classification number to bibliographic records they create or update. More details are available at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/litauthno.html

B1.5.2.3 New Topical, Geographic or Artist Cutters (LCC)

BIBCO libraries must use LC artist, geographic, and topical Cutters (i.e., all Cutters that can be considered to be part of the actual classification number (subfield $a) and not specific to the edition of a work that is in hand (subfield $b)) when those have been established by LC. If LC has not established such Cutters, then BIBCO libraries may assign one, conforming to the appropriate practice for the schedule in use, and input it in the 050 (second indicator "4"). LC may change the Cutter later if they need to deal with the particular entity it represents. There is no expectation, however, that the BIBCO library will monitor this and later revise their earlier BIBCO record so that the Cutter conforms to LC's. However, all future BIBCO records must use the newly-established LC Cutter.

Unlike the optional verification process for literary author Cutters or numbers, there is no process for a BIBCO library to have LC verify new artist numbers or Cutters or new geographic Cutters. However, new topical Cutters may be submitted as part of a SACO proposal, if appropriate.

B1.5.2.4 Bibliography numbers (LCC)

LC recognizes that it is not practical for all libraries to follow LC classification policies in all respects. LC classes topical bibliographies in specific topical numbers in Class Z and provides an alternative number for those same topics from other classes. This is performed as a service of the national cataloging agency.

BIBCO libraries may choose to classify a PCC designated bibliographic record either in an established number for the topic in Z or in a number for that topic in other LCC classes. To improve the efficacy of this procedure, BIBCO libraries are asked not to supply an alternative number in either case.

B1.5.2.5 Series Classified Together

The BIBCO policy on series analysis and classification practice allows for BIBCO libraries to vary from the LC decision with respect to both these procedures (Cf. DCM Z1, 64X section; see also: Series FAQ). This means that a BIBCO library may choose to follow LC practice or choose to analyze and classify separately a BIBCO designated record.

When assigning an individual classification number, BIBCO libraries are asked not to supply the collected set number in the bibliographic record along with the individual number.

B1.5.3 Dewey Decimal Classification

The Dewey Decimal Classification system (DDC) is a general knowledge organization tool that is continuously revised to keep pace with knowledge. The system was conceived by Melvil Dewey in 1873 and first published in1876. The DDC is published by Forest Press, which in 1988 became a division of OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc. It is the most widely used library classification system in the world, used in more than 135 countries.

BIBCO libraries using Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) should assign a classification number using the current, full edition of the DDC appropriate to the specificity of the material in hand. Input the number in field 082 and use value "4" (assigned by agency other than LC) in the second indicator position. If a BIBCO library employs a number suggested as an option in the DDC, or a non-standard DDC number for its local catalog, it may do one of the following:

> 1)   not submit the record as a BIBCO record;
>
> 2)   if the input system they are using supports a local call number field (092), input the variant number in that field, supply in field 082 a classification number that reflects standard DDC practice, and submit the record as a BIBCO record.

The Dewey Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee (EPC), a ten-member international board whose main function is to advise the editors and OCLC Forest Press on matters relating to changes, innovations, and the general development of the Classification, accepts proposals for additions or changes to the DDC. Information about the EPC is available on the Web at: http://www.oclc.org/dewey/news/epc/index.htm

B1.5.4   National Library of Medicine Classification

The National Library of Medicine Classification system covers the field of medicine and related sciences. The scheme is intended to be used for the arrangement of all library materials, regardless of format. Designed as a broad classification, it is suitable for both large and small library collections and may be adapted to handle specialized collections of any size. It is patterned after the Library of Congress Classification and utilizes schedules QS-QZ and W-WZ that have been permanently excluded from LCC. It is intended to be used with the LCC schedules which supplement *NLM Classification* for subjects bordering on medicine and for general reference materials. The LCC schedules for Human Anatomy (QM), Microbiology (QR), and Medicine (R) are not used at all by the National Library of Medicine since they overlap the *NLM Classification*.

BIBCO Libraries using the National Library of Medicine Classification should assign a classification number using the current, full edition of the *NLM Classification* appropriate to the specificity of the material in hand and following the classification practices described in that tool. Input the number in field 060 and use value "4" (assigned by agency other than NLM) in the second indicator position. If a BIBCO library employs a variant number, the variant number should be input in a local call number field.

The National Library of Medicine accepts proposals for new classification numbers. Suggestions should be addressed to the Head, Cataloging Section, National Library of Medicine, 8600 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, Maryland 20894.

B1.6   Special Cataloging Issues

B1.6.1 Non-Roman Materials

Program records are encoded in a basic complement of character sets referred to as the "Latin base" (ASCII, ANSEL, MARC21 Greek, MARC21 subscript, MARC21 superscript). The Supplementary Core Standard for Multiple Character Sets (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/nonromancore.html)
 provides for including additional data in non-roman form encoded in other character sets designated for use in MARC21 records. Such records consist of data encoded in multiple character sets.

The supplementary core standard should be applied to all PCC records created for monographic materials, whether Core or Full. Records created with this supplementary core standard should conform to the requirements of the appropriate PCC monographic Core standard first and this supplementary Core second.

In all cases, PCC libraries must include in roman form all of the data elements as specified in the core standard for the type of material being cataloged. Although the decision to include data in non-roman form in any PCC record is strictly optional, when that option is exercised, it must be done so according to this supplementary core standard. Catalogers adding data in non-roman form to records are encouraged to consider the future use and international implications of their records and to include as much of the original script data as necessary to facilitate the identification and location of this often scarce material and its component parts.

B1.6.1.1 Chinese Language Materials

Beginning October 1, 2000, libraries contributing records to OCLC or RLIN have been required to use pinyin for systematically romanized Chinese language data in new bibliographic records. These records must contain the 987 pinyin conversion marker, as defined at http://www.loc.gov/marc/pinyin.html.

BIBCO libraries should do all cataloging in pinyin, filling in the 987 field as appropriate and marking the record as a BIBCO record (042=pcc) if the record meets BIBCO guidelines.

OCLC BIBCO participants are especially encouraged to review and upgrade any record whose 987 subfield $d indicates that it is marked for review (code 'r'). As part of the upgrade, the 987 field should also be edited to reflect the results of the manual review and conversion.

B1.6.1.2 Headings and Authority Records for Non-Roman Materials

National level authority records must be used and/or created to support romanized forms of headings. National level authority records created by NACO libraries currently cannot support headings in non-roman form.

When headings are supplied in non-roman form, names used in headings or portions of headings (e.g., name alone; name/title; name as subject/subject subdivision; name/series title) may be input as "paired" names. Geographic subject headings may be input as paired fields. Translations of subject headings MAY be input but must be done so in a manner that clearly indicates they are non-standard (uncontrolled index terms (field 653) or identified as "source not specified" (6XX with second indicator "4")).

B1.6.2 Special formats

There are separate core standards for most formats or type of material, as detailed on the BIBCO home page (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco.html) under **Approved Core Standards**. Beyond the determination of which elements are required for a Core record for material in a specific format, BIBCO records are expected to follow standard AACR2/LCRI cataloging and MARC21 coding for the format or material in question. There are no special requirements imposed by the BIBCO program on the cataloging of any materials or formats.

B1.6   Special Cataloging Issues

B1.6.1 Non-Roman Materials

Program records are encoded in a basic complement of character sets referred to as the "Latin base" (ASCII, ANSEL,MARC 21 Greek, MARC 21 subscript, MARC 21 superscript). The Supplementary Core Standard for Multiple Character Sets (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/nonromancore.html)
 provides for including additional data in non-roman form encoded in other character sets designated for use in MARC 21 records. Such records consist of data encoded in multiple character sets.

The supplementary core standard should be applied to all PCC records created for monographic materials, whether PCC Core or PCC Full. Records created with this supplementary core standard should conform to the requirements of the appropriate PCC monographic PCC Core standard first and this supplementary PCC Core second.

In all cases, PCC libraries must include in roman form all of the data elements as specified in the PCC Core standard for the type of material being cataloged. Although the decision to include data in non-roman form in any PCC record is strictly optional, when the option is exercised, it must be done according to this supplementary core standard. Catalogers adding data in non-roman form to records are encouraged to consider the future use and international implications of their records and to include as much of the original script data as necessary to facilitate the identification and location of this often scarce material and its component parts.

B1.6.1.1 Chinese Language Materials

Beginning October 1, 2000, libraries contributing records to OCLC or RLIN have been required to use pinyin for systematically romanized Chinese language data in new bibliographic records. These records must contain the 987 pinyin conversion marker, as defined at http://www.loc.gov/marc/pinyin.html.

BIBCO libraries should do all cataloging in pinyin, filling in the 987 field as appropriate and marking the record as a BIBCO record (042=pcc) if the record meets BIBCO guidelines.

OCLC BIBCO participants are especially encouraged to review and upgrade any record whose 987 subfield $d indicates that it is marked for review (code 'r'). As part of the upgrade, the 987 field should also be edited to reflect the results of the manual review and conversion.

B1.6.1.2 Headings and Authority Records for Non-Roman Materials

National level authority records must be used and/or created to support romanized forms of headings. National level authority records created by NACO libraries currently cannot support headings in non-roman form.

When headings are supplied in non-roman form, names used in headings or portions of headings (e.g., name alone; name/title; name as subject/subject subdivision; name/series title) may be input as "paired" names. Geographic subject headings may be input as paired fields. Translations of subject headings MAY be input but must be done so in a manner that clearly indicates they are non-standard (uncontrolled index terms (field 653) or identified as "source not specified" (6XX with second indicator "4")).

B1.6.2 Special formats

There are separate PCC Core standards for most formats or type of material, as detailed on the BIBCO home page (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco.html) under **Approved Core Standards**. Beyond the determination of which elements are required for a PCC Core record for material in a specific format, BIBCO records are expected to follow standard AACR/LCRI cataloging and MARC 21 coding for the format or material in question. There are no special requirements imposed by the BIBCO program on the cataloging of any materials or formats.

B2   Current Cataloging

Current cataloging is first-time cataloging for an institution and is done with piece in hand. Current cataloging may involve creation of or maintenance of BIBCO records.

B2.1   New Input of Original Cataloging

All records newly input as part of current cataloging, regardless of the database(s) to which they are contributed, must use MARC21 and be created according to AACR2 and related Library of Congress rule interpretations (see B1.3 above). Newly-input names, series, and subject headings must meet the BIBCO standards, as set forth in B1.4.

B2.1.1   OCLC

In addition to meeting the standards articulated in B2.1, BIBCO records entered into the OCLC database must follow OCLC bibliographic input standards articulated in Bibliographic Formats and Standards (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/bib/toc.htm). In addition, BIBCO libraries must also follow the Enhance Training Outline (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/enhance/outline.htm) and Guidelines for National Level Enhance Participants (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/enhance/guidelines.htm). BIBCO libraries may contribute records to OCLC via direct input, tapeload, or FTP.

B2.1.2   RLIN

In addition to meeting the standards articulated in B2.1, BIBCO records entered into the RLG Union Catalog generally must conform to National Level Record (NLR) requirements http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/nlr/), plus any RLIN-system-required fields. Full-level records must contain a full complement of subject headings from a subject heading list or thesaurus recognized in MARC 21 by an indicator value or a source code having been assigned. If the subject heading scheme used is not LCSH or MeSH, at least one LCSH or MeSH heading at the appropriate level of specificity must be included as well. BIBCO libraries may contribute records to RLIN via direct input, tapeload, or FTP.

B2.1.3   Local Systems

Libraries may create BIBCO records directly in their local systems as long as they follow the standards articulated in B2.1 and agree to make them available in a timely manner via one or more of the bibliographic utilities.

B2.1.4   **Adaptation of Records from Another Utility or Catalog**

Although catalogers are not expected to search more than one utility's database before creating a BIBCO record, they may encounter BIBCO or other usable records in another database because BIBCO records are not automatically redistributed to all the major utilities. If such a record is subsequently entered into the other database, the contributing library should follow the MARC coding conventions and use the other library's MARC code in the subfield $a of the 040 and its own symbol in the subfield $c of the 040.

B2.2   **Updating of an Existing Non-BIBCO Record**

Bibliographic records residing in either the OCLC or RLIN databases may be candidates for updating to the level of a BIBCO Core or Full record. As well as following the standards for record content articulated in B1, catalogers should also consult the utilities' documentation for the procedures to be followed to convert an existing record and authenticate it as a BIBCO record.

B2.3   **Modifications to Existing BIBCO Records**

The cataloger determines whether changes are needed in an existing BIBCO record, according to the policies outlined in B3. BIBCO participants agree to maintain open lines of communication with other PCC partners and especially with other BIBCO members in an effort to encourage the precept that the responsibility for maintaining the integrity of Program records is shared by all participants. When one BIBCO library has a question about a BIBCO record created by another library, the BIBCO liaisons at both institutions discuss the issues and decide which library is to make any needed modifications to the existing BIBCO record.

B2   **Current Cataloging**

Current cataloging is first-time cataloging for an institution and is done with piece in hand.
Current cataloging may involve creation or maintenance of BIBCO records.

B2.1   **New Input of Original Cataloging**

All records newly input as part of current cataloging, regardless of the database(s) to which they
are contributed, must use MARC 21 and be created according to AACR and related *Library of
Congress Rule Interpretations* (see B1.3 above). Newly-input names, series, and subject
headings must meet the BIBCO standards, as set forth in B1.4.

B2.1.1   **OCLC**

In addition to meeting the standards articulated in B2.1, BIBCO records entered into the OCLC
database must follow OCLC bibliographic input standards articulated in Bibliographic Formats
and Standards (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/bib/toc.htm). In addition, BIBCO libraries must also
follow the Enhance Training Outline
(http://www.oclc.org/worldcat/enhance/trainingoutline.shtm) and Guidelines for National Level
Enhance Participants (http://www.oclc.org/worldcat/enhance/guidelines.shtm). BIBCO libraries
may contribute records to OCLC via direct input, tapeload, or FTP.

B2.1.2   **RLIN**

In addition to meeting the standards articulated in B2.1, BIBCO records entered into the RLG
Union Catalog generally must conform to National Level Record (NLR) requirements
http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/nlr/), plus any RLIN-system-required fields. Full-level
records must contain a full complement of subject headings from a subject heading list or
thesaurus recognized in MARC 21 by an indicator value or a source code having been assigned.
If the subject heading scheme used is not LCSH or MeSH, at least one LCSH or MeSH heading at
the appropriate level of specificity must be included as well. BIBCO libraries may contribute
records to RLIN via direct input, tapeload, or FTP.

B2.1.3   **Local Systems**

Libraries may create BIBCO records directly in their local systems as long as they follow the
standards articulated in B2.1 and agree to make them available in a timely manner via one or
more of the bibliographic utilities.

B2.1.4   Adaptation of Records from Another Utility or Catalog

Although catalogers are not expected to search more than one utility's database before creating a BIBCO record, they may encounter BIBCO or other usable records in another database because BIBCO records are not automatically redistributed to all the major utilities. If such a record is subsequently entered into the other database, the contributing library should follow the MARC coding conventions and use the other library's MARC code in the subfield $a of the 040 and its own symbol in the subfield $c of the 040.

B2.2   Updating of an Existing Non-BIBCO Record

Bibliographic records residing in either the OCLC or RLIN databases may be candidates for updating to the level of a PCC Core or PCC Full record. As well as following the standards for record content articulated in B1, catalogers should also consult the utilities' documentation for the procedures to be followed to convert an existing record and authenticate it as a BIBCO record.

B2.3   Modifications to Existing BIBCO Records

The cataloger determines whether changes are needed in an existing BIBCO record, according to the policies outlined in B3. BIBCO participants agree to maintain open lines of communication with other PCC partners and especially with other BIBCO members in an effort to encourage the precept that the responsibility for maintaining the integrity of Program records is shared by all participants. When one BIBCO library has a question about a BIBCO record created by another library, the BIBCO liaisons at both institutions discuss the issues and decide which library is to make any needed modifications to the existing BIBCO record.

B3   Record maintenance

Record maintenance is the process of ensuring the continued authoritativeness of a BIBCO record through additions, changes, or deletions:

1)   To correct errors;

2)   To reflect changes in the publication (integrating resources), or;

3)   To reflect changes to policies and practices used within BIBCO for the bibliographic control of the publication.

The degree to which a record is changed may depend on the activity that the cataloger is performing, the availability of information, and the record's encoding level. The action taken may involve making the change on a record or consulting with the Library of Congress or another BIBCO library about the change.

B3.1   Correcting errors

Members are responsible for correcting typographical errors and errors in content designation whenever they are encountered in a record that is already designated as a BIBCO record or is about to be authenticated as such. Correct these errors wherever they occur; however, bear in mind that what appears to be an error is not always so. Always compare the information in the record to the piece(s) in hand and keep in mind that another cataloger's judgment may legitimately be different from yours.

B3.2   Changes in the publication (integrating resources)

With the recent increase in the number of integrating resources due to the rise in materials published electronically, there has developed a greater awareness outside of the serials community for the need to modify bibliographic records to reflect changes in the publication itself. In February 2001, the PCC initiated the Task Group on Implementation of Integrating Resources to look at the maintenance issues and to make recommendations for the division of work between CONSER and BIBCO libraries, as well as the development of training and documentation. The full report of that Task Group with detailed recommendations is available at: (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/tgintegrfinal.pdf). The development of training modules and documentation for integrating resources are developed, all OCLC and RLIN contributing libraries are encouraged to maintain the bibliographic records for these resources utilizing the. It is expected that BIBCO and CONSER libraries encountering a record for an integrating resource (print or electronic) in the course of cataloging will modify the data elements in the record so that it continues accurately to describe and analyze the content of the publication.

B3.3   Changes in cataloging codes, RIs or BIBCO practice

One of the central tenets of BIBCO as a cooperative program has been the authentication procedure, whereby the bibliographic description and access points in a catalog record are

verified as being in conformity with BIBCO bibliographic conventions and agreed-upon practices. In general, an authenticated BIBCO record should not be updated merely to reflect changes in cataloging codes or BIBCO practice. Usually, an authenticated record will continue to serve the purposes of BIBCO even though the rules and/or rule interpretations according to which it was constructed have been superseded. The instruction below addresses an instance where this is not the case.

B3.3.1. Pre-AACR 2 vs. AACR 2 rules of entry

If a BIBCO library wishes to authenticate a pre-AACR2 record as BIBCO, it must change the description to AACR2, as well as make certain that all access points are in AACR2 form and under authority control.

B3.4   Changes in classification or content analysis to reflect current practice

BIBCO members may make changes to subject analysis fields that clearly do not correlate with the subject matter of the publication. Data should be removed from records only when clearly incorrect, not just when a matter of judgment on predominant subject emphasis. When there is doubt, fields should not be changed without consultation with the originating library.

> 1) Subject headings.
>
> The cataloger adds, changes, or deletes subject headings to reflect vocabulary changes in standard subject heading lists as well as heading and subdivision assignment practices in such source documents as Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings, etc. Redundant, largely duplicate fields should be removed from a record.
>
> 2) Classification.
>
> The cataloger adds, changes, or deletes classification fields to reflect additions and changes to standard classification schemes. A clear exception to this is a call number assignment by a national library; in this case, an updated class number may be added to the record in a separate field.

B3.5   Changes to authority-controlled fields

If an authority record for a heading has changed since a BIBCO record was contributed, the next BIBCO library to use the record may make the needed corrections without consulting with the originating library. Requirements for Bibliographic File Maintenance (BFM) as outlined in the NACO Participants' Manual must be followed. There is no corresponding BFM requirement for other libraries.

B3   Record maintenance

Record maintenance is the process of ensuring the continued accuracy of a BIBCO record
through additions, changes, or deletions:

>   1)   To correct errors;
>
>   2)   To reflect changes in the publication (integrating resources), or;
>
>   3)   To reflect changes to policies and practices used within BIBCO for bibliographic
>   control.

The degree to which a record is changed may depend on the activity that the cataloger is
performing, the availability of information, and the record's encoding level. The action taken
may involve making the change on a record or consulting with the Library of Congress or another
BIBCO library about the change.

B3.1   Correcting errors

Members are responsible for correcting typographical errors and errors in content designation
whenever they are encountered in a record that is already designated as a BIBCO record or is
about to be authenticated as such. Correct these errors wherever they occur; however, bear in
mind that what appears to be an error is not always so. Always compare the information in the
record to the piece(s) in hand and keep in mind that another cataloger's judgment may
legitimately be different from yours.

B3.2   Changes in the publication (integrating resources)

With the recent increase in the number of integrating resources due to the rise in materials
published electronically, there has developed a greater awareness outside of the serials
community for the need to modify bibliographic records to reflect changes in the publication
itself. In February 2001, the PCC initiated the Task Group on Implementation of Integrating
Resources to look at the maintenance issues and to make recommendations for the division of
work between CONSER and BIBCO libraries, as well as the development of training and
documentation. The full report of that Task Group with detailed recommendations is available at:
(http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/tgintegrfinal.pdf). The development of training modules and
documentation for integrating resources are developed, all OCLC and RLIN contributing libraries
are encouraged to maintain the bibliographic records for these resources utilizing the. It is
expected that BIBCO and CONSER libraries encountering a record for an integrating resource
(print or electronic) in the course of cataloging will modify the data elements in the record so that
it continues accurately to describe and analyze the content of the publication.

B3.3   Changes in cataloging codes, RIs or BIBCO practice

One of the central tenets of BIBCO as a cooperative program has been the authentication
procedure, whereby the bibliographic description and access points in a catalog record are

verified as being in conformity with BIBCO bibliographic conventions and agreed-upon practices. In general, an authenticated BIBCO record should not be updated merely to reflect changes in cataloging codes or BIBCO practice. Usually, an authenticated record will continue to serve the purposes of BIBCO even though the rules and/or rule interpretations according to which it was constructed have been superseded. The instruction below addresses an instance where this is not the case.

B3.3.1. Pre-AACR2 description and rules of entry

If a BIBCO library wishes to authenticate a pre-AACR2 record as BIBCO, it must change the description to the latest version AACR, as well as make certain that all access points are in current AACR form and under authority control.

B3.4   Changes in classification or content analysis to reflect current practice

BIBCO members may make changes to subject analysis fields that clearly do not correlate with the subject matter of the publication. Data should be removed from records only when clearly incorrect, not just when a matter of judgment on predominant subject emphasis. When there is doubt, fields should not be changed without consultation with the originating library.

> 1) Subject headings.
>
> The cataloger adds, changes, or deletes subject headings to reflect vocabulary changes in standard subject heading lists as well as heading and subdivision assignment practices in such source documents as Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings, etc. Redundant, largely duplicate fields should be removed from a record.
>
> 2) Classification.
>
> The cataloger adds, changes, or deletes classification fields to reflect additions and changes to standard classification schemes. A clear exception to this is a call number assignment by a national library; in this case, an updated class number may be added to the record in a separate field.

B3.5   Changes to authority-controlled fields

If an authority record for a heading has changed since a BIBCO record was contributed, the next BIBCO library to use the record may make the needed corrections without consulting with the originating library. Requirements for Bibliographic File Maintenance (BFM) as outlined in the NACO Participants' Manual must be followed. There is no BFM requirement for other libraries' records.

B4   Retrospective conversion

Retrospective conversion is the process of turning a library's existing paper or microform catalog records into machine-readable records. Such records have normally been created according to earlier cataloging codes and conventions, before the adoption of AACR2. Retrospective conversion involves the online input of these records into the MARC format, often without piece(s) in hand.

In 2001, BIBCO members considered permitting records to be coded as BIBCO without the need to upgrade the description to AACR2, as long as the headings were under authority control. They discussed the consideration of a new 042 code for BIBCO libraries wishing to code records entered as part of a retrospective conversion process as BIBCO records. The majority of BIBCO member libraries affirmed that one of the tenets of the BIBCO program is that records will be entered according to AACR2 description.

Any library undertaking retrospective conversion may code those records as BIBCO only if they also upgrade the description to AACR2. In order to do that, they must also have the piece(s) in hand. If the library wishes to do retrospective conversion without upgrading the descriptive elements, the records may not be coded as BIBCO.

B5.   BIBCO Record Requirements

BIBCO records must meet or exceed Core record standards. They must also meet the input standards of the bibliographic utility through which they are being contributed, and follow AACR2 and LC Rule Interpretations for descriptive cataloging. BIBCO records are identifiable via a special code of "pcc" that appears in the MARC21 042 field. In addition, the source code (008/39) must be "c" for cooperative, unless the record began as a record from a national library, in which case the source code will remain "blank".

B5.1   Core

The Core record standard specifies a minimum set of data elements for different types of material which must always be included in any Core record, yet may also be exceeded, if the cataloger or the institution deems it necessary. Records that lack this minimum set of MARC fields cannot be considered to be Core records. While the principle is constant, different data elements were identified for each format or type of material. For Core records to be high quality records, they must be created by catalogers exercising good judgment. Whenever the cataloger judges that a field that is not required by the Core record standard is nevertheless clearly necessary to create a useful record, that field should be included in the bibliographic record.

B5.1.1 Rationale

The Core record standard was defined in 1994 by a Task Group appointed by the Cooperative Cataloging Council now known as the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC). The Task Group was charged to develop cost-effective bibliographic standards that would be acceptable to a wide range of libraries. The concept of a core record predated the work of the Cooperative Cataloging Council Task Group on Standards which borrowed the term from earlier efforts. The idea of a core record was introduced in the 1980's in IFLA working documents and there has been wide discussion of the core record in the international context. CONSER was also an early proponent of the core record standard and has produced core bibliographic standards for serials in various formats. One of the main recommendations of the original Standards Task Group was that subsequent Task Groups of specialists in the cataloging of non-book format and non-Roman alphabet materials be appointed to develop core record standards for such materials. This was the model followed by the Standing Committee on Standards (SCS) as it developed the Core standards for different types of material. The SCS reviews the standards periodically to keep them up to date and reflective of current practice.

The Core record represents a level of cataloging between minimal- and full-level cataloging. Given the costs of cataloging and the shrinking resources in libraries, the PCC recognized the need for a new cataloging tool and developed the Core record standards. Recognizing that authority control is usually the most expensive aspect of cataloging, a key component built into the Core record was the requirement that access points be under full authority control in the international authority file, with the exceptions explained in Section B.1.4. Once a heading is established in the international file, it is then available for repeated use in other records. Another aspect of the Core record is that it sets a base floor of data elements within a format which must always be included in any Core record, yet may also be exceeded, thereby providing institutions with a new level of flexibility in their local cataloging. One of the premises of the Core record is that it will take less time to create, in that the cataloger's time is spent describing, establishing

authoritative forms for, and providing access to only the most significant data elements. The goal was to enable us to produce more records faster and more cheaply. Thus, it would be wise to use the following rule of thumb: when in doubt about the usefulness of a non-core field in a Core record, leave it out.

B5.1.2 Core standards

Core records can be identified by the encoding level (Leader/17) of "4". PCC BIBCO Core records can be distinguished from other core records by the addition of an 042 value of "pcc" to indicate that the record was created by a PCC participant BIBCO library. Although non-BIBCO libraries can use the core level standard and the corresponding encoding level of "4", only records created by BIBCO libraries will include an 042 value of "pcc."

The Core standards that have been defined are listed below with the links to the Web pages:

Core Record for Books (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/corebook.html)

Core Bibliographic Record for Collections (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/corecoll.html)

Core Record for Monographic Computer Files (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/cfcore.html)

Core Record for Rare Books (DCRB Core) (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/dcrbcore.html)

Core Record for Graphic Materials (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/coregm.html)

Core Record for Moving Image Materials (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/coremim.html)

Core Record for Music and non-Music Sound Recordings (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/coremusic.html)

Core Record for Printed Music and Music Manuscripts (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/coremusmss.html)

Supplementary Core for Multiple Character Sets (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/nonromancore.html)

B5.2   Full standards

There are currently no written standards for Full records. There are some expectations about Full BIBCO records that currently reside only in the corporate memory and that differ depending on the utility through which records are contributed. Recognizing that this is a shortcoming of the Program, the Standing Committee on Standards is working on articulating and clarifying the

standards for a BIBCO Full record. Until those standards have been articulated, BIBCO libraries are encouraged to abide by the Full level input standards of their respective utility.

C1.1 NACO Overview

NACO, the name authority component of the PCC is the underlying foundation for participation in BIBCO and CONSER. Only those institutions that are independent for NACO may be considered candidates for BIBCO. One of the chief reasons for this requirement is that the founders of the PCC felt that the emphasis on cataloger judgement called for by AACR2r, the LCRIs and the Descriptive Cataloging Manual applied throughout the NACO procedures would prepare catalogers to assimilate the philosophy of working in a shared bibliographic environment.

C1.2 History of NACO

The Name Authority Cooperative Project began in 1977 as a joint project between the Library of Congress and the U.S. Government Printing Office the goal was a common authority file which would reduce the cost of authority work (often viewed as the most expensive aspect of cataloging). Early manual procedures of having paper authority forms mailed to LC on paper worksheets and then re-keyed have given way to FTP contribution. Today, copies of all new and changed records are re-distributed by LC on a daily basis to the OCLC, RLG, the British Library, and to CDS customers. During the Cooperative Cataloging Council deliberations LC's leadership role in the training and coordination of the NACO program was reaffirmed and it is LC's Cataloging Policy and Support Office at the Library of Congress which sets policy and procedures for the program. The benefits of NACO are quite tangible: those who benefit the most are LC, the cooperating libraries, and the national and international cataloging communities. This is because the costs of authority work is shared, the duplication of effort is reduced, timeliness is improved and coverage of the National Authority File (NAF) is expanded. NACO members share their expertise with the library community by serving as trainers and representatives to the governing body of NACO on the PCC Policy Committee. Since 1992 contributions to the file have risen dramatically. Fiscal year 96 witnessed the one millionth contribution to the file by NACO partners and today, NACO-contributed records account for roughly one half of all new name and series records in the authority file which contains ca. 5 million records.

C1.3 NACO Documentation

All NACO participants agree to use and apply the guidelines found in the following documentation:

- The *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* (second revised edition)
- The *MARC 21 Authority Format* (including the LC Guidelines Supplement (known as the **blue pages** and the DCM Z1 addition issued by the Library of Congress (known as the **yellow pages**))
- The *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations* (LCRIs)
- The *Library of Congress Subject Cataloging Manual* (SCM) Memo H405
- *LC-ALA Romanization Tables*

Ad-hoc information which may be used to supplement the above information includes:

- The *NACO Participants' Manual, 2nd ed.* (Currently under revision)

PCC NACO Home Page FAQs

- FAQ on the 670 field
- FAQ on reporting Bibliographic File Maintenance
- FAQ on creating/formulating headings and references for authority records in NACO

Reminder: LC's CPSO is the official arbiter of NACO procedures and policies. Often changes in LCRIs, and other documentation is issued on the CPSO Home Page before it appears in the documentation.

C1.4 NACO Relationship to BIBCO

The hallmark of a BIBCO record is that whether it is created at the core level or further enriched all access points are under authority control. The fact that the authority file is a dynamic file often causes much confusion for non-BIBCO libraries as many have found that access points on BIBCO records will fall out of synch when a changed is made to a 1XX heading in a name authority record. Often BIBCO libraries have work streams which result in a bibliographic record being added to the database long before the authority record is uploaded into the authority file, etc.

Both of these factors have been under discussion at BIBCO-At-Large meeting and at BIBCO Operations Committee meetings and much progress has been made in narrowing the gap in keeping the bibliographic records and authority records in synch. One such mechanism is that OCLC has developed programming to update headings on bibliographic records in WorldCat when an extant NAR 1XX heading is changed; another is the raising of awareness of BIBCO and non-BIBCO libraries of the need for reporting bibliographic file management to each other, to LC, and to the utility within which one works.

Although being an active, independent NACO participation is a requirement for BIBCO membership it is not necessary for NACO participants to contribute series authority records. If BIBCO member libraries wish to contribute Program records without creating authority records for series that are not yet established, they may contribute them at the Core level and code the series as 490 0 on the bibliographic records.

C2.1 SACO Overview

SACO, Subject Authority Cooperative Program provides a means for individual catalogers to propose subject headings for inclusion in the Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) and classification number proposals or changes for inclusion in the Library of Congress Classification (LCC) schedules. Unlike the other PCC programs, participation in SACO is not institution or utility based. Due to this flexibility, interested catalogers contribute needed headings to reflect users' needs for subject specificity worldwide.

C2.2 History of SACO

The Subject Authority Cooperative Program has its roots in the Cooperative Subject Cataloging Projects (CSCP) which officially began in 1983, as a part of LC's Subject Cataloging Division when the first CSCP coordinator was named in October. In 1984, the National Library of Medicine (NLM) took on the responsibility for descriptive cataloging of medical cataloging in publication (CIP) titles and contributed MeSH subject access points and NLM classification numbers to medical titles cataloged as CIP records. With the expansion of online cataloging, projects were formulated by CSCP to increase the number of cooperative cataloging participant libraries. These libraries were to become the founding libraries of the National Coordinated Cataloging Program (NCCP). CSCP became responsible for the administration of the subject cataloging aspects of the program. LC's Office of the Principal Cataloger (Subject Policy Office) was made responsible for training the participants and reviewing bibliographic records and subject authority proposals. The period of 1988-89 saw a dramatic increase in the number of subject headings contributed by NCCP participants, while the subject authority work continued to be done by the Library of Congress staff. In 1988 a general call went out in the "Cataloging Service Bulletin" inviting proposals from anyone willing to fill out the forms and to follow the written procedures. By 1990 NCCP libraries prepared their own subject heading proposals thus shifting the focus of the program to make participants more self-reliant and to treat the NCCP program catalogers as equal partners. The advent of Internet use assisted and improved communication between LC and the cooperative partners allowing immediate feedback to the participants, especially when the email proposal form became available on LC's MARVEL enabling quicker submission of subject proposals. In 1993 the Subject Authority Cooperative Program (SACO) replaced CSCP and became a component part of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging. In 1994 the British Library decided to reinstate the use of LCSH in their records for the British National Bibliography, thus adding the international dimension to the program. Currently there are sixteen institutions outside the United States contributing to SACO, producing 21% of all new SACO proposals.

C2.3 SACO Documentation

SACO participants agree to use and apply the guidelines found in the following documentation:

> *Subject Cataloging Manual : Subject Headings*

Subject Cataloging Manual : Classification
Free-Floating Subdivisions : An Alphabetical Index, 12th ed.

Ad-hoc information which may be used to supplement the above information includes:

The *SACO Participants' Manual (being published)*

PCC SACO Home Page

FAQ on SACO Heading Proposals
FAQ on Canadian Subject Headings
List of Web resources for use in preparing proposals
Subject and Classification proposal forms and guidelines
Weekly lists of tentative and approved subject headings

Reminder : LC's CPSO is the official arbitrator of LC subject authority procedures and policies. Refer to the CPSO Home Page for new documentation and changes in procedures and polices.

C2.4 SACO Relationship to BIBCO

BIBCO records are readily identified as monographic records that are notable for having **all access points** supported by internationally available authority records and for providing **subject analysis** at the appropriate level of specificity. Although being an active, independent NACO participant is a requirement for BIBCO. Participation in the SACO program, a component part of the PCC, remains a popular choice for subject authorities. BIBCO participants may choose to use other internationally recognized subject heading thesauri such as AAT or MeSH, besides LCSH, and other classification numbers from internationally recognized schemes such as Dewey or the National Library of Medicine's classification, besides LCC.

April 13, 2001

D. Tools and How to Access Them

Tools which have been suggested or required for use by BIBCO participants throughout this Manual are listed and briefly described below with information as to where and how to access the most current versions.

With the obvious exceptions (e.g., AACR2, MeSH) the majority of tools listed are available from the Library of Congress' Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS). The CDS website at: http://www.loc.gov/cds/ contains a list of all these tools along with price and ordering information. Note that many of these tools are subscription based with updates issued on a quarterly basis. CDS may also be reached at:

Library of Congress
> Cataloging Distribution Service
> Washington, D.C. 20541-4912
> Voice: 202-707-6100
> Fax: 202-707-1334
> Email: cdsinfo@loc.gov

D1. MARC Documentation
Available from CDS and on *Cataloger's Desktop*.

MARC (MAchine-Readable Cataloging) is a coding scheme which allows a computer to "read" and interpret data in cataloging records. The basic MARC documents for authority and bibliographic records are complete listings of all the data which may be contained in MARC formatted records with a descripion of what the data is expected to communicate to the computer. These basic documents are:

MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data List of bibliographic fields and data available at: http://lcweb.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/ecbdlist.html

> Note that for BIBCO purposes the MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data **may not be used as a stand alone document**. The Format must be used in conjunction with the format documentation of each bibliographic utility. Each utility will have a list of MARC fields and data which may or maynot be input and what data are kept or deleted upon distribution, etc.

MARC 21 Format for Authority Data List of authority fields and data available at: http://lcweb.loc.gov/marc/authority/ecadlist.html One subscription per each NACO institution provided at no cost to the participant.

> Note that for BIBCO purposes the MARC 21 Format for Authority Data **may not be used as a stand-alone document**. The basic format is augmented by supplements written by CPSO and issued to participating institutions by the Cooperative Cataloging Team. These supplements constitute the *Descriptive Cataloging Manual Z1* which is issued in print on yellow colored paper

and the *LC Guidelines Supplement to the MARC format for Authority Data*issued in print on blue colored paper.

Descriptive Cataloging Manual Z1
One subscription per each NACO institution provided at no cost to the participant.

Provides an expanded definition of the cataloging data which is to be input into the various MARC fields. It also provides PCC Program policy and procedural instructions for LC and PCC catalogers to follow in the creation and maintenance of name authority records.

LC Guidelines Supplement to the MARC format for Authority Data One subscription per each NACO institution provided at no cost to the participant.

Defines the MARC fields and data which are actively supplied by LC and which will be accepted by LC's database for redistribution.

D2. *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2nd ed., rev. 1998

The basic set of cataloging rules which have been in use by U.S. libraries since the early 1980's. AACR2 is a joint publication of the American Library Association, the Canadian Library Association and the Library Association (of Great Britain) it is available in print, CD-Rom, and as part of the Library of Congress' Cataloger's Desktop. Updates are issued as needed; pricing information may be found at the Library Association's website at: http://www.la-hq.org.uk/directory/publications.html

Note that for BIBCO purposes AACR2 **may not be used as a stand-alone document**. The Library of Congress Rule Interpretations (LCRIs) supplement AACR2 and provides LC and PCC catalogers with the official cataloging policy and practices required for submission of authority and bibliographic records.

D3. *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations*, 1990. Updates issued quarterly.

Available from CDS in print, CD-Rom, and on Cataloger's Desktop. One subscription per each NACO institution of the print copy provided at no cost to the participant.

The LCRIs supplement AACR2 by recording the decisions taken by LC on options provided for in various rules, by recording rule replacement decisions, early implementation of a soon-to-be published change to AACR2, and/or rule amplification or explanation. For BIBCO purposes the LCRIs are viewed as the de-facto official cataloging policy and practices required for submission of authority and bibliographic records.

D4. Codes (Geographic, Language, Country of Publication)

All MARC code lists are available from CDS and on Cataloger's Desktop

MARC Code List for Languages

Contains a list of languages and their associated three-character alphabetic codes that allow for the designation of the language or languages in MARC records.

MARC Code List for Countries
Contains places and their associated two-or three-character lower case alphabetic codes used in MARC records.

MARC Code List for Geographic Areas
A geographic areas and their associated one- to seven-character codes used in MARC records. The list includes separate codes for countries, first order political divisions of some countries, regions, and geographic features.

D5. LC Online Catalog
Accessible on the web at: http://catalog.loc.gov/

Searching the LC Online Catalog is not a requirement of the BIBCO program; however, for those libraries using LC classification it greatly enhances the ability to devise call numbers for BIBCO records. This catalog may be searched using browse or key-words searches:

> browse = left-match browse by typing in subject, name, or call-number
> guided key-word = after typing in search word a series of drop-down menus guide the user to define type of search desired
> command key-word= uses punctuation, boolean operators and/or code to search

Note: Authority records are not viewable on the LC Online Catalog at this time; however, headings used on bibliographic records in the LC Online Catalog are linked to authority records via the references structure, thus leading the user to the correct use of an authorized heading.

D6. Subject Thesauri and Classification Schemes

Library of Congress Subject Headings Available from CDS. Issued annually in print (5 vols.) and updated quarterly on Cataloger's Desktop.

LCSH is also available on microfiche; however for BIBCO purposes it is suggested that participants check the most current copy of LCSH through the subject authority files available on the bibliographic utilities. These files are updated via FTP distribution from LC, although, due to varying practices with the FTP uploading of subject files it is also suggested that BIBCO participants check the CPSO website at: http://www.loc.gov/cpso/ to view the weekly lists of approved subject headings.

LC Subject Headings Weekly Lists Available only on the Library of Congress Cataloging Policy and Support Office (CPSO) Web page http://www.loc.gov/cpso (and linked from the SACO homepage). This

list is updated weekly all new subject headings created, changed or deleted are available and searchable via the web server.

LC Subject Cataloging Manual : Subject Headings
Available from CDS in print form and on Cataloger's Desktop.

This is the how-to guide for assigning subject headings and subdivisions in a consistent and standardized manner--as practiced at the Library of Congress. This manual provides the rationale for assigning subject headings to specific works and is indispensable for BIBCO participants.

LC Free-Floating Subdvisions : An Alphabetical Index
Available from CDS.
Lists all subdivisions designated as free-floating. Free-floating refers to a form or topical subdivision assigned by the subject cataloger under designated subjects without the usage being established editorially and without the usage appearing in the subject authority file under each individual subject heading. Also helps locate information in the Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings, in which free-floating subdivisions appear in 40 separate lists.

Art & Architecture Thesaurus
Available on the Web http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/vocabulary/aat/ or by license at the Getty Vocabularies website: http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/vocabulary/obtain.html#aatvocab
Structured vocabularies that can be used to improve access to information about art, architecture, and material culture.

MeSH, Annotated Alphabetic List; *MeSH Tree Structures*, etc.
http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/meshhome.html
Published by NTIS print ordering information is available at: http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/pubs.html

The website for the Medical Subject Headings comprise NLM's controlled vocabulary used for indexing articles, for cataloging books and other holdings, and for searching MeSH-indexed databases. MeSH terminology provides a consistent way to retrieve information that may use different terminology for the same concepts and is an excellent source for use in BIBCO library's SACO proposals for medical headings.

Dewey Decimal Classification
http://www.oclc.org/fp/ Published by Forest Press this product is published in two editions, full and abridged. The Classification is kept up-to-date electronically through electronic versions: Dewey for Windows, a CD-ROM product that is updated annually and released in January; and WebDewey in CORC, a Web-based product that is updated quarterly.

A general knowledge organization tool that is continuously revised to keep pace with knowledge. The system was conceived by Melvil Dewey in 1873 and first published in 1876.

LC Subject Cataloging Manual : Classification
Available from CDS and on Cataloger's Desktop.
A practical, time-saving, how-to manual that helps you assign LC classification numbers to library materials following LC policy and standards. Instruction sheets contain step-by-step procedures. Guidelines help you formulate the classification portion of the LC call number.

LC Classification Schedules, A-Z
Available from CDS in print, also available from commercial vendors.

A handy guide to the schedules. Updates available on the LC Website at www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso

Classification Plus
Available from CDS. A full-text, Windows-based CD-ROM product that contains the Library of Congress Classification Schedules and Library of Congress Subject Headings. Classification Plus is available as an annual subscription with quarterly issues.

SACO website
http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/saco.html Includes forms for submitting proposals and guidelines for the content. FAQs on the creation of headings and other background as well as a list of Web Resources useful for justification/verification of subject headings including links to: MeSH, AAT, GEOnet, etc.

D7. Other

CDS' *Cataloger's Desktop*
Available from CDS. Cataloging publications on one CD-ROM disc, includes: Library of Congress Rule Interpretations, Subject Cataloging Manual: Classification, Subject Cataloging Manual: Shelflisting, Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings, MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data, MARC 21 Format for Authority Data , MARC 21 Format for Holdings Data, MARC 21 Format for Classification Data, MARC 21 Format for Community Information. The latest editions of all 5 MARC Code Lists and Archives, Personal Papers and Manuscripts: A Cataloging Manual, Archival Moving Image Materials: A Cataloging Manual, Cataloging Rules for the Description of Looseleaf Publications, CONSER Cataloging Manual, CONSER Editing Guide, Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books, Graphic Materials, Map Cataloging Manual, Music Cataloging Decisions, Standard Citation Forms for Published Bibliographies used in Rare Book Cataloging, Thesaurus for Graphic Materials, Descriptive Cataloging Manual - Z1: Names and Series Authority Records , AC (Annotated Card) Children's Subject Headings (Moved to Classification Plus with Issue 2, 1997), LC Cutter Table as a separate info base, Library of Congress Filing Rules, NACO Participants' Manual and will also include the SACO Participants' Manual.

Bibliographic Utility Tools

OCLC Documentation
OCLC cataloging documentation is available on the OCLC Web site at:
(http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/documentation.htm)

> For BIBCO purposes the Guidelines for National Level Enhance Participants must be applied by OCLC members contributing BIBCO records via OCLC:
> (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/enhance/guidelines.htm)

RLIN Documentation
RLIN cataloging documentation is available on the RLG Information Center Web site at:
(http://www.rlg.org/ric/ric.html)

Format and Rationale of BIBCO Examples

Every cataloger knows that cataloging is a matter of judgment and interpretation. Although catalogers follow guidelines and standards, ultimately the representation of a bibliographic entity using codes and standards is highly subjective. The examples provided have been developed and reviewed by experienced catalogers. To the best of our collective ability, they were correct at the time they were made available. As the cataloging rules and interpretations change, examples may become outdated. The intention of the following examples is to illustrate the judgment involved in choosing to use Core versus Full standards, not to provide absolute guidance on how to catalog certain materials. If they are consulted in that spirit, they will be useful even after specific rules have changed. Because the examples are merely illustrative of the concepts, in some cases, authority work that would be expected for a real BIBCO record has not been done.

The examples contain both Core and Full records, with certain fields highlighted in ***bold italics*** on the Full records. These are fields that are optional for Core records. Because standards for Full records have not yet been developed, there may be data elements in some of the Full examples that are also optional.

Each Core record example contains a brief outline of some of the reasons why the record is labeled Core. The intent of the discussion is to explain the thought process and assist catalogers in exercising good judgment about how they might apply Core standards. Some optional data elements may be included in Core records and not all data elements will be discussed in every example. Catalogers are expected to refer to the Core standards for complete information.

Examples reflect one institution's interpretation of what makes a record Core or Full. Another institution may have a different interpretation and still be completely accurate.

Each example is numbered and labeled to identify the type of material being described. The intention was to present examples that are database and vendor-neutral. Although the examples reflect MARC21 content designation, they differ slightly in form in that for clarity of presentation, each subfield code is preceded and followed by a space. Delimiters are represented by dollar signs $.

Blank elements in 006 fields are represented by underscoring _.

007 fields are represented both as they would appear in RLIN and OCLC.

No 008 fields are provided in any example. Catalogers are encouraged to consult MARC21 documentation and the input standards of their respective utility for details on 008 coding.

Books Format

FULL

020	0799212741
042	pcc
043	*f-sa----* *(043 is not required for Full records)*
050 4	HT148.S68 $b S78 1990
245 02	A study of the effects of urbanisation on the health of women in Khayelitsha, Cape Town : $b rationale and methods.
260	Cape Town : $b Urbanisation and Women's Health Project, Department of Community Health, University of Cape Town, $c [1990]
300	iii, 10 p. : $b ill., maps ; $c 30 cm.
490 1	Working paper / University of Cape Town, Medical School, Dept. of Community Health ; $v no. 1
500	Cover title.
500	*"Authors: W.M. Pick, D. Cooper, J.M.L. Klopper, J.E. Myers, M. Hoffman, L. Kuhn"--P. 1.*
500	*"August 1990."*
504	*Includes bibliographical references (p. 9-10).*
650 0	Urbanization $z South Africa $z Cape Town.
650 0	Women, Black $x Health and hygiene $z South Africa $z Cape Town.
650 0	*Public health $z South Africa $z Cape Town.*
700 1	Pick, W. M.
710 2	University of Cape Town. $b Urbanisation & Women's Health.
830 0	Working paper (University of Cape Town. Urbanisation & Women's Health) ; $v no. 1.

CORE

020	0799212741
042	pcc
050 4	HT148.S68 $b S78 1990
245 02	A study of the effects of urbanisation on the health of women in Khayelitsha, Cape Town : $b rationale and methods.
260	Cape Town : $b Urbanisation and Women's Health Project, Department of Community Health, University of Cape Town, $c [1990]
300	iii, 10 p. : $b ill., maps ; $c 30 cm.
490 1	Working paper / University of Cape Town, Medical School, Dept. of Community Health ; $v no. 1
500	Cover title.
650 0	Urbanization $z South Africa $z Cape Town.
650 0	Women, Black $x Health and hygiene $z South Africa $z Cape Town.
700 1	Pick, W. M.
710 2	University of Cape Town. $b Urbanisation & Women's Health.
830 0	Working paper (University of Cape Town. Urbanisation & Women's Health) ; $v no. 1.

What makes this record a Core record?

- *There is no 500 justifying the 700.*
- *There is no 500 justifying the brackets around the date in the 260.*
- *The subject analysis covers only the primary topics.*

Access has not been adversely affected. Data elements that serve to explain the cataloger's decisions have been left out, as has one subject heading covering a secondary topic.

Books Format

FULL

020	2910164101
041 0	*engfre*
042	pcc
043	*e-fr---* *(043 is not required for Full records)*
050 4	NB237.B65 $b A4 1995
100 1	Bourgeois, Louise, $d 1911-
245 10	Louise Bourgeois : $b Ecole nationale des beaux-arts de Bourges / $c [texte, Geneviève Bréerette ; traduction, Simon Pleasance].
260	Bourges, France : $b L'Ecole, $c 1995.
300	1 v. (unpaged) : $b ill. (some col.) ; $c 21 cm.
546	***English and French.***
500	Cover title.
500	***Catalog of an exhibition held at the Galerie La Box from Jan. 30 to March 18, 1995.***
504	***Includes bibliographical references.***
600 10	Bourgeois, Louise, $d 1911- $v Exhibitions.
700 1	Bréerette, Geneviève.
710 2	Ecole nationale des beaux-arts de Bourges.
710 2	***Galerie La Box.***

CORE

020		2910164101
042		pcc
050	4	NB237.B65 $b A4 1995
100	1	Bourgeois, Louise, $d 1911-
245	10	Louise Bourgeois : $b Ecole nationale des beaux-arts de Bourges / $c [texte, Geneviève Bréerette ; traduction, Simon Pleasance].
260		Bourges, France : $b L'Ecole, $c 1995.
300		1 v. (unpaged) : $b ill. (some col.) ; $c 21 cm.
500		Cover title.
600	10	Bourgeois, Louise, $d 1911- $v Exhibitions.
700	1	Bréerette, Geneviève.
710	2	Ecole nationale des beaux-arts de Bourges.

What makes this record a Core record?

- *There is no 041 or 546.*
- *There is no 500 to indicate where the exhibition was held..*
- *There is no 504 (the 008 would still include the code for a bibliography).*
- *There is no 500 or 041 to explain that the text is in two languages (the $c of the 245 already makes that clear).*
- *The 710 for the gallery that hosted the exhibition has not been included.*
- *The remaining 710 would not be strictly required for the Core record but was considered an important data element in the judgment of the cataloger.*

Access has not been adversely affected. Data elements that serve to explain the cataloger's decisions or to restate information already presented in another form have been left out. Depending upon the nature of the collection and the way materials are used at his library, the cataloger might decide that some of the optional data elements are important and include them.

Books Format

FULL

020		0800772040
042		pcc
082	04	823 $2 21
100	0	Pelé, $d 1940-
245	14	The World Cup murder / $c Pelé with Herbert Resnicow.
260		New York, N.Y. : $b Wynwood Press, $c c1988.
300		318 p. ; $c 22 cm.
700	1	Resnicow, Herbert.

CORE

020	0800772040
042	pcc
082 04	823 $2 21
100 0	Pelé, $d 1940-
245 14	The World Cup murder / $c Pelé with Herbert Resnicow.
260	New York, N.Y. : $b Wynwood Press, $c c1988.
300	318 p. ; $c 22 cm.
700 1	Resnicow, Herbert.

What makes this record a Core record?

- *It is often the case that there is no difference between a Full and a Core record for belles letters. Coding the record either way would be a matter of a library's local policy or cataloger's judgment.*

Books Format

FULL

020	0140235868
042	pcc
043	***e-yu---*** ***(043 is not required for Full records)***
050 4	DR1313 $b .G57 1994
100 1	Glenny, Misha.
245 14	The fall of Yugoslavia : $b the third Balkan war / $c Misha Glenny.
250	Rev. and updated ed.
260	New York, N.Y. : $b Penguin Books, $c 1994.
300	xiii, 257 p. : $b 4 maps ; $c 20 cm.
500	***Includes index.***
650 0	Yugoslav War, 1991-1995.

CORE

020	0140235868
042	pcc
050 4	DR1313 $b .G57 1994
100 1	Glenny, Misha.
245 14	The fall of Yugoslavia : $b the third Balkan war / $c Misha Glenny.
250	Rev. and updated ed.
260	New York, N.Y. : $b Penguin Books, $c 1994.
300	xiii, 257 p. : $b 4 maps ; $c 20 cm.
650 0	Yugoslav War, 1991-1995.

What makes this record a Core record?

- *There is no eye-readable note indicating that the work includes an index, although the 008 would still include the code for an index. Because template records or function keys make it easy to include standard notes in records, a local institution or the cataloger might choose to do a Full record in this case without any loss of time or efficiency.*

Books Format

FULL

042		pcc
050	4	TP245.C4 **$b F67 1993a**
100	1	Foster, Kenneth Lee.
245	14	The role of micropore size and chemical nature of the pore surface on the adsorption properties of activated carbon fibers / $c by Kenneth Lee Foster.
260		$c 1993.
300		xiv, 189 leaves : $b ill. ; $c 29 cm.
502		Thesis (Ph. D.)--University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1993.
504		*Includes bibliographical references (leaves 184-188).*
533		Photocopy. $b Ann Arbor, Mich. : $c UMI, $d 1994. $e xiv, 189 p. ; 22 cm.
500		*"9411625."*
650	0	Carbon, Activated.
650	0	Porosity.
650	*0*	*Gases $x Absorption and adsorption $x Measurement.*
650	*0*	*Volatile organic compounds.*
650	*0*	*Gas flow.*
650	*0*	*Decontamination (from gases, chemicals, etc.)*

CORE

042		pcc
050	4	TP245.C4
100	1	Foster, Kenneth Lee.
245	14	The role of micropore size and chemical nature of the pore surface on the adsorption properties of activated carbon fibers / $c by Kenneth Lee Foster.
260		$c 1993.
300		xiv, 189 leaves : $b ill. ; $c 29 cm.
502		Thesis (Ph. D.)--University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1993.
533		Photocopy. $b Ann Arbor, Mich. : $c UMI, $d 1994. $e xiv, 189 p. ; 22 cm.
650	0	Carbon, Activated.
650	0	Porosity.

What makes this record a Core record?

- *The call number field only includes the classification. The subfield $b portion (Cutters relating to specific shelf location) are not required for Core records, even for those formats where a classification number is required. A library that does not ordinarily classify some types of materials might supply a classification number in order to be able to submit a record as a BIBCO record but would have no need (or obligation within the Program) to supply the shelf location Cutter.*
- *There is no 504 (the 008 would still include the code for a bibliography).*
- *There is no 500 to account for unexplained numbering that appears on the piece.*
- *The subject analysis covers only the primary topics.*

Access has not been adversely affected. The 500 note would not add any information for a library user. Additional subject headings could be included if the local collection were sufficiently specialized to make them useful.

FULL

020	0646196073
042	pcc
043	*u-at-we* *(043 is not required for Full records)*
050 4	QE571 $b .S43 1994
245 04	The sedimentary basins of Western Australia / $c edited by P.G. and R.R. Purcell.
246 14	*Proceedings, West Australian Basins Symposium, Perth, Western Australia, 1994*
260	Perth, W.A. : $b Petroleum Exploration Society of Australia, $c 1994.
300	x, 864 p., [7] folded p. of plates : $b ill. (some col.), maps (some col.) ; $c 29 cm.
500	*"Based on the proceedings of the West Australian Basins Symposium sponsored by the Western Australian Branch of the Petroleum Exploration Society of Australia Limited and held in Perth, Western Australia, August 14-17, 1994"--Added t.p. verso.*
500	*Pre-published proceedings, July 1994. Cf. pref.*
504	*Includes bibliographical references.*
505 0	*Introduction -- Basin framework and evolution -- Petroleum systems and resources -- North West Shelf -- Bonaparte Basin -- Browse Basin -- Carnarvon Basin -- Barrow and Exmouth Sub-Basins -- Dampier and Beagle Sub-Basins -- North West Shelf fields and discoveries -- Canning Basin -- Perth Basin -- Proterozoic basins.*
650 0	Sedimentary basins $z Australia $z Western Australia $v Congresses.
650 0	Petroleum $x Geology $z Australia $z Western Australia $v Congresses.
650 0	Geology, Stratigraphic $v Congresses.
650 0	*Oil fields $z Australia $z Western Australia $v Congresses.*
700 1	Purcell, Peter G.
700 1	Purcell, R. R. $q (Robyn R.)
711 2	West Australian Basins Symposium $d (1994 : $c Perth, W.A.)
710 2	*Petroleum Exploration Society of Australia. $b Western Australian Branch.*

CORE

020	0646196073
042	pcc
050 4	QE571 $b .S43 1994
245 04	The sedimentary basins of Western Australia / $c edited by P.G. and R.R. Purcell.
260	Perth, W.A. : $b Petroleum Exploration Society of Australia, $c 1994.
300	x, 864 p., [7] folded p. of plates : $b ill. (some col.), maps (some col.) ; $c 29 cm.
650 0	Sedimentary basins $z Australia $z Western Australia $v Congresses.
650 0	Petroleum $x Geology $z Australia $z Western Australia $v Congresses.
650 0	Geology, Stratigraphic $v Congresses.
700 1	Purcell, Peter G.
700 1	Purcell, R. R. $q (Robyn R.)
711 2	West Australian Basins Symposium $d (1994 : $c Perth, W.A.)

What makes this record a Core record?

- *There is no 246 for an alternative form of the title.*
- *A 500 note justifying the 711 is not included.*
- *There is no 504 (the 008 would still include the code for a bibliography).*
- *A contents note has not been included. Contents notes are required when there are multipart items with separate titles.*
- *The subject analysis covers only the primary topics.*
- *The sponsoring agency has not been deemed a necessary access point.*

Data elements that serve to explain the cataloger's decisions or to restate information already presented in another form have been left out, as has one subject heading covering a secondary topic. Depending upon the nature of the collection and the way materials are used at her library, the cataloger might decide that some of the optional data elements are important and include them.

Books Format

FULL

020	0312155344	
042	pcc	
043	**e-uk-en**	***(043 is not required for Full records)***
050 4	ML421.B4 $b S87 1997	
100 1	Sulpy, Doug.	
240 10	**Drugs, divorce, and a slipping image**	
245 10	Get back : $b the unauthorized chronicle of the Beatles' "Let it be" disaster / $c Doug Sulpy, Ray Schweighardt.	
250	1st St. Martin's Press ed.	
260	New York : $b St. Martin's Press, $c 1997.	
300	332 p. ; $c 25 cm.	
500	**Includes index.**	
610 20	Beatles. $t Let it be.	
650 0	Rock musicians $z England $v Biography.	
700 10	Schweighardt, Ray.	

CORE

020	0312155344
042	pcc
050 4	ML421.B4 $b S87 1997
100 1	Sulpy, Doug.
245 10	Get back : $b the unauthorized chronicle of the Beatles' "Let it be" disaster / $c Doug Sulpy, Ray Schweighardt.
250	1st St. Martin's Press ed.
260	New York : $b St. Martin's Press, $c 1997.
300	332 p. ; $c 25 cm.
610 20	Beatles. $t Let it be.
650 0	Rock musicians $z England $v Biography.
700 10	Schweighardt, Ray.

What makes this record a Core record?

- *The uniform title is not provided because it was not readily available. This saves research time for the cataloger without compromising access for the library user.*
- *There is no eye-readable note indicating that the work includes an index, although the 008 would still include the code for an index.*

Music Format

FULL

028 30   MM112 $b Margun Music, Inc.
042   pcc
045 1 $b d1917 $b d1947
048   wa01 $a wb01 $a wc01 $a ba01 $a wd01
050 4   M559.R32 $b T6 1995
100 1   Ravel, Maurice, $d 1875-1937.
240 10   Tombeau de Couperin; $o arr.
245 13   Le tombeau de Couperin / $c Maurice Ravel ; arr. by Gunther Schuller.
260   Newton, MA (167 Dudley Road, Newton Centre, MA 02159) : $b Margun
          Music, $c 1995.
300   1 miniature score (41 p.) ; $c 22 cm.
306   002400
500   Arr. for flute (or piccolo), oboe, clarinet in A, horn in F, and bassoon;
          originally for piano.
*500   "The present arrangement of Ravel's 'Tombeau de Couperin,' although
          only published in 1995, dates from 1947."*
500   Duration: 24 min.
505 0   Prelude – Fugue – Forlane – Rigaudon – Menuet – Toccata.
500   Publisher's no.: MM112.
650 0   Suites (Bassoon, clarinet, flute, horn, oboe), Arranged $v Scores.
600 10   Couperin, François, $d 1668-1733 $v Songs and music.
700 1   Schuller, Gunther.

CORE

028	30	MM112 $b Margun Music, Inc.
042		pcc
050	4	M559.R32 $b T6 1995
100	1	Ravel, Maurice, $d 1875-1937.
240	10	Tombeau de Couperin; $o arr.
245	13	Le tombeau de Couperin / $c Maurice Ravel ; arr. by Gunther Schuller.
260		Newton, MA (167 Dudley Road, Newton Centre, MA 02159) : $b Margun Music, $c 1995.
300		1 miniature score (41 p.) ; $c 22 cm.
500		Arr. for flute (or piccolo), oboe, clarinet in A, horn in F, and bassoon; originally for piano.
500		Publisher's no.: MM112.
650	0	Suites (Bassoon, clarinet, flute, horn, oboe), Arranged $v Scores.
700	1	Schuller, Gunther.

What makes this record a Core record?

- *The 045 and 048 are not included.*
- *The 306 is not provided..*
- *A 500 note providing background information on the item is not included.*
- *A note indicating the duration of the piece is left out.*
- *A contents note has not been supplied.*
- *The subject analysis covers only the primary topic.*

Music Format

FULL

RLIN:

007	SOUND RECORDING (COM:s))
	SMD:d SPD:f SND:u GRV:n DIM:g WID:n TC:n KD:m KM:m KC:n RC:e CAP:d

OCLC:

007		s $b d $d f $e u $f n $g g $h n $i n $j m $k m $l n $m e $n d
028	02	RIC 098112 $b Ricercar
033	*00*	*199201—*
041	0	$g engfreger $h fre
042		pcc
045	*2*	*$b d1624 $b d1698*
047		*cz $a pv $a sn $a su*
048		*se05 $a ke*
048		*se08 $a ke*
048		*se03 $a ke*
048		*se02 $a ke*
048		*se01 $a ke*
048		*se04*
245	00	Deutsche Barock Kammermusik. $n V $h [sound recording].
260		[Belgium?] : $b Ricercar ; $a [New York] : $b [distributed by] Qualiton Imports, $c [1992?]
300		1 sound disc : $b digital ; $c 4 ¾ in.
500		Music for 1-8 viole da gamba and continuo.
511	0	Ricercar Consort ; Philippe Pierlot, conductor.
518		*Recorded at the Filosofisch Theologisch College van de Societeit van Jezus V.Z.W. Heverlee, Jan. 1992.*
500		*Compact disc.*
500		*Distributor from label on container.*
500		*Program notes in French with English and German translations (23 p.) inserted in container.*
505	*0*	*Canzon à 5 voc. Super O Nachbar Roland / Samuel Scheidt (6:24) – Canzon mitt 8 Viol di gamben / Johan Hentzschel (4:32) – Padouana V (4:35) ; Gagliarda V (2:16) / Isaac Posch – Sonata à tre viol da gamba (d-moll) / Johann Michael Nicolai (13:12) – Sonata II à 2 (e-moll) / August Kühnel (11:07) – Sonata (a-moll) / Johan Schenck (6:29) – Suite (D-Dur) / David Funck (8:58)*
650	0	Viola da gamba and continuo music.
650	0	Trio sonatas (Viole da gamba (2) and continuo)
650	*0*	*Sonatas (Viola da gamba and continuo)*
650	*0*	*Suites (Viole da gamba (4))*
650	0	Viol ensembles.
650	*0*	*Chamber music $z Germany $y 17th century.*
700	1	Pierlot, Philippe. $4 cnd

700 12   Scheidt, Samuel, $d 1587-1654. *$t Paduana, galliarda, couranta, alemande, intrada, canzonetto. $p Canzon super O Nachbar Roland.*

700 12   Hentzschel, Johann. *$t Canzona, $m viole da gamba (8), continuo.*

700 12   Posch, Isaac, $d d. 1622 or 3. *$t Musicalische Tafelfreudt. $p Paduana, $n no. 5.*

700 12   Posch, Isaac, $d d. 1622 or 3. *$t Musicalische Tafelfreudt. $p Gagliarda, $n no. 5.*

700 12   Nicolai, Johann Michael, $d 1629-1685. *$t Sonatas, $m viole da gamba (3), continuo, $r D minor.*

700 12   Kühnel, August, $d 1645-ca. 1700*. $t Sonate o partite. $p Sonata, $n no. 2.*

700 12   Schenck, Johann, $d 1656?-ca. 1712. *$t Scherzi musicali. $p Sonata, $r A minor.*

700 12   Funck, David, $d 1629-1690. *$t Stricturae viola-di gambicae. $k Selections.*

710 2   Ricercar consort. $4 prf

740 01   O Nachbar Roland.

CORE

RLIN:

007	SOUND RECORDING (COM:s))
	SMD:d SPD:f SND:u GRV:n DIM:g WID:n TC:n KD:m KM:m KC:n RC:e CAP:d

OCLC:

007		s $b d $d f $e u $f n $g g $h n $i n $j m $k m $l n $m e $n d
028	02	RIC 098112 $b Ricercar *(unlike Core standards for books,*
041	0	$g engfreger $h fre *parts of the 041 are required for*
042		pcc *sound recordings)*
245	00	Deutsche Barock Kammermusik. $n V $h [sound recording].
260		[Belgium?] : $b Ricercar ; $a [New York] : $b [distributed by] Qualiton Imports, $c [1992?]
300		1 sound disc : $b digital ; $c 4 ¾ in.
500		Music for 1-8 viole da gamba and continuo.
511	0	Ricercar Consort ; Philippe Pierlot, conductor.
505	0	Canzon à 5 voc. Super O Nachbar Roland / Samuel Scheidt (6:24) – Canzon mitt 8 Viol di gamben / Johan Hentzschel (4:32) – Padouana V (4:35) ; Gagliarda V (2:16) / Isaac Posch – Sonata à tre viol da gamba (d-moll) / Johann Michael Nicolai (13:12) – Sonata II à 2 (e-moll) / August Kühnel (11:07) – Sonata (a-moll) / Johan Schenck (6:29) – Suite (D-Dur) / David Funck (8:58)
650	0	Viola da gamba and continuo music.
650	0	Trio sonatas (Viole da gamba (2) and continuo)
650	0	Viol ensembles.
700	1	Pierlot, Philippe. $4 cnd
700	1	Scheidt, Samuel, $d 1587-1654.
700	1	Hentzschel, Johann.
700	1	Posch, Isaac, $d d. 1622 or 3.
700	1	Nicolai, Johann Michael, $d 1629-1685.
700	1	Kühnel, August, $d 1645-ca. 1700.
700	1	Schenck, Johann, $d 1656?-ca. 1712.
700	1	Funck, David, $d 1629-1690.
710	2	Ricercar consort. $4 prf

What makes this record a Core record?

- *There are no optional 0XX fields.*
- *There is no 518 containing that information in textual form.*
- *There are no 500 notes to state information that is already provided elsewhere or to justify elements of the description.*
- *There is no contents note.*
- *Subject analysis covers only the primary topics.*
- *Analytic title entries are not provided.*

Visual Materials Format

FULL

RLIN:

007	VIDEORECORDING (COM:v)
	SMD:f CL:m VF:b SEP:a MDS:h WD:o KS:u

OCLC:

007		v $b f $d m $e b $f a $g h $h o $i u	
028	40	FFH 2698 $b Films for the Humanities	
042		pcc	
043		*e-uk-en*	*(043 is not required for Full)*
050	*4*	*DA677 $b .L63 1991 no.6*	*(multiple classification numbers*
050	*4*	*DA683 $b .L63 1991*	*are not required)*
082	*04*	*942*	
245	00	Late Victorian London $h [videorecording] : $b the hub of the world, 1850-1897 / $c produced by John Michael Phillips ; Thames colour production.	
246	*30*	*Hub of the world, 1850-1897*	
246	1	$i Title on container: $a London, 1850-1897	
260		Princeton, NJ : $b Films for the Humanities, $c c1991.	
300		1 videocassette (20 min.) : $b sd., col. with b&w sequences ; $c ½ in.	
440	0	London, the making of a city	
538		VHS.	
511	*0*	*Host: Benny Green.*	
508		*Camera, Frank Hodge; editor, Oscar Webb.*	
500		*Originally broadcast in 1976.*	
520		Describes London from 1850-1897, as railways began to carve up London, the great expropriations of land began, suburbia was born, and sewers were constructed. By 1900, the outlines of modern London had been fixed, the population reached 6.5 million, and living conditions for the poor continued to worsen while the more fortunate enjoyed the good life.	
651	0	London (England) $x History $y 19th century.	
651	0	London (England) $x Description and travel.	
651	*0*	*Great Britain $x History $y 19th century.*	
700	1	Phillips, John Michael.	
700	*1*	*Green, Benny, $d 1927-*	
710	2	Films for the Humanities (Firm)	
710	*2*	*Thames International (Firm)*	

CORE

RLIN:

007	VIDEORECORDING (COM:v)
	SMD:f CL:m VF:b SEP:a MDS:h WD:o KS:u

OCLC:

007		v $b f $d m $e b $f a $g h $h o $i u
028	40	FFH 2698 $b Films for the Humanities
042		pcc
245	00	Late Victorian London $h [videorecording] : $b the hub of the world, 1850-1897 / $c produced by John Michael Phillips.
246	1	$i Title on container: $a London, 1850-1897
260		Princeton, NJ : $b Films for the Humanities, $c c1991.
300		1 videocassette (20 min.) : $b sd., col. with b&w sequences ; $c ½ in.
440	0	London, the making of a city
538		VHS.
520		Describes London from 1850-1897, as railways began to carve up London, the great expropriations of land began, suburbia was born, and sewers were constructed. By 1900, the outlines of modern London had been fixed, the population reached 6.5 million, and living conditions for the poor continued to worsen while the more fortunate enjoyed the good life.
651	0	London (England) $x History $y 19th century.
651	0	London (England) $x Description and travel.
700	1	Phillips, John Michael.
710	2	Films for the Humanities (Firm)

What makes this record a core record?

- *There is no classification required for Core records for moving image materials.*
- *There is no alternative form of the title provided.*
- *Optional notes to justify added entries are not provided.*
- *Subject analysis covers primary topics only.*
- *Several added entries not considered essential are not included.*

Visual Materials Format

FULL

RLIN:

007	VIDEORECORDING (COM:v)
	SMD:f CL:m VF:b SEP:a MDS:h WD:o KS:u

OCLC:

007		v $b f $d m $e b $f a $g h $h o $i u	
020		1565018788	
024	*1*	*3396114123*	*(024 is not required for Full records)*
028	42	AAE-14123 $b A&E Home Video	
042		pcc	
043		*e-ur---*	*(043 is not required for Full records)*
050	*4*	*NK7398.F32 $b F324 1996*	
245	04	The fabulous world of Fabergé $h [videorecording] / $c Weller/Grossman Productions for A&E Network ; producer and writer, Sue Nadell.	
260		[New York, N.Y.] : $b A&E Home Video : *$b New Video Group [distributor]*, $c 1996.	
300		1 videocassette (50 min.) : $b sd., col. with b&w sequences ; $c ½ in.	
538		VHS.	
508		*Narrator, Robb Weller ; editor, Andrew Corwin.*	
520		Traces the life of Peter Carl Fabergé, a jeweler and goldsmith whose creations transcended mere decoration. He became famous in Russia when he crafted a jeweled Easter egg for Czar Alexander III. This is the story of an artist whose priceless masterpieces continue to captivate people worldwide.	
500		*One episode of the television program Biography.*	
600	10	Fabergé, Peter Carl, $d 1846-1920.	
610	*20*	*Fabergé (Firm)*	
650	0	Jewelry $z Russia $x History $y 20th century.	
650	*0*	*Jewelers $v Biography.*	
650	0	Art objects, Russian.	
650	*0*	*Easter eggs $z Russia $x History.*	
650	*0*	*Decorative arts $z Russia $x History.*	
650	*0*	*Documentary television programs.*	
700	1	Nadell, Sue.	
700	*1*	*Corwin, Andrew.*	
700	*1*	*Weller, Robb.*	
710	2	Weller/Grossman Productions.	
710	2	Arts and Entertainment Network.	
710	2	A & E Home Video (Firm)	
710	*2*	*New Video Group.*	
730	*0*	*Biography (Television program)*	

CORE

RLIN:

007   VIDEORECORDING (COM:v)
     SMD:f CL:m VF:b SEP:a MDS:h WD:o KS:u

OCLC:

007   v $b f $d m $e b $f a $g h $h o $i u
020   156018788
028 42 AAE-14123 $b A&E Home Video
042   pcc
245 04 The fabulous world of Fabergé $h [videorecording] / $c Weller/Grossman
     Productions for A&E Network ; producer & writer, Sue Nadell.
260   [New York, N.Y.] : $b A&E Home Video, $c c1996.
300   1 videocassette (50 min.) : $b sd., col. with b&w sequences ; $c ½ in.
538   VHS.
520   Traces the life of Peter Carl Fabergé, a jeweler and goldsmith whose creations
     transcended mere decoration. He became famous in Russia when he crafted a
     jeweled Easter egg for Czar Alexander III. This is the story of an artist whose
     priceless masterpieces continue to captivate people worldwide.
600 10 Fabergé, Peter Carl, $d 1846-1920.
650 0 Jewelry $z Russia $x History $y 20th century.
650 0 Art objects, Russian.
700 1 Nadell, Sue.
710 2 Weller/Grossman Productions.
710 2 Arts and Entertainment Network.
710 2 A & E Home Video (Firm)

What makes this record a Core record?

- *Classification is optional for this format and is not included.*
- *Distributor information is not included.*
- *500 fields justifying added entries and the accompanying added entries are not included.*
- *Subject analysis covers primary topics only.*

If the cataloger had considered the added entries important, they could have been provided; there still would have been no need for the 5XX fields to justify the added entries.

Books Format

FULL

020	0226242005
020	*0226242013 (pbk.)*
042	pcc
050 4	HQ1190 $b .B48 1993
245 00	Beyond economic man : $b feminist theory and economics / $c edited by Marianne A. Ferber and Julie A. Nelson.
260	Chicago : $b University of Chicago Press, $c 1993.
300	178 p. ; $c 24 cm.
504	*Includes bibliographical references and index.*
505 0	*Introduction : the social construction of economics and the social contruction of gender / Marianne A. Ferber and Julie A. Nelson -- The study of choice or the study of provisioning? Gender and the definition of neoclassical assumptions / Paula England -- Not a free market : the rhetoric of disciplinary authority in economics / Diana Strassmann -- Some consequences of a conjective economics / Donald N. McCloskey -- Socialism, feminist and scientific / Nancy Folbre -- Public or private? Institutional economics and feminism / Ann L. Jennings -- Discussion and challenges. What should mainstream economists learn from feminist theory? / Rebecca M. Blank -- Race, deconstruction, and the emergent agenda of feminist economic theory / Rhonda M. Williams -- Feminist theory, women's experience, and economics / Robert M. Solow -- Economics for whom? / Helen E. Longino.*
650 0	Feminist economics.
700 1	Ferber, Marianne A., $d 1923-
700 1	Nelson, Julie A., $d 1956-

CORE

020   0226242005
042   pcc
050 4   HQ1190 $b .B48 1993
245 00   Beyond economic man : $b feminist theory and economics / $c edited by
                 Marianne A. Ferber and Julie A. Nelson.
260   Chicago : $b University of Chicago Press, $c 1993.
300   178 p. ; $c 24 cm.
650 0   Feminist economics.
700 1   Ferber, Marianne A., $d 1923-
700 1   Nelson, Julie A., $d 1956-

What makes this record a Core record?

- *Multiple 020 fields are not included.*
- *There is no 504 (the 008 would still include the code for a bibliography and index).*
- *No contents note is included. If the cataloger considered it important, s/he could provide a partial contents note and still code this as a Core record.*

Books Format

FULL

020	0486246124 (pbk.)
042	pcc
050 4	TT840 **$b .N558 1984**
100 1	Nicholls, Elgiva.
245 10	Tatting : $b technique & history / $c Elgiva Nicholls.
260	New York : $b Dover Publications, $c 1984.
300	128 p., 18 p. of plates : $b ill. ; $c 24 cm.
500	*Reprint. Originally published: London : Vista Books, 1962.*
504	*Includes bibliographical references (p. 126) and index.*
650 0	Tatting.

CORE

020	0486246124 (pbk.)
042	pcc
050 4	TT840
100 1	Nicholls, Elgiva.
245 10	Tatting : $b technique & history / $c Elgiva Nicholls.
260	New York : $b Dover Publications, $c 1984.
300	128 p., 18 p. of plates : $b ill. ; $c 24 cm.
650 0	Tatting.

What makes this record a Core record?

- *The call number field only includes the classification. The subfield $b portion (Cutters relating to specific shelf location) are not required for Core records, even for those formats where a classification number is required.*
- *There is no note giving the history of the publication.*
- *There is no 504 (the 008 would still include the code for a bibliography and index).*

Books Format

FULL

020	0801846242
020	*0801846277 (pbk.)*
042	pcc
082 04	809/.93354 $2 21
245 00	Death and representation / $c edited by Sarah Webster Goodwin and Elisabeth Bronfen.
260	Baltimore : $b Johns Hopkins University Press, $c c1993.
300	vii, 336 p. : $b ill. ; $c 24 cm.
490 1	Parallax
500	*Chiefly a collection of essays originally presented at a colloquium held Nov. 1988 at the Harvard Center for Literary and Cultural Studies.*
504	*Includes bibliographical references.*
505 0	*Touching death / Ernst van Alphen -- A valediction for bidding mourning : death and the narratee in Brontë's Villette / Garrett Stewart -- Lacan, the death drive, and the dream of the burning child / Ellie Ragland Sullivan -- Risky resemblances : on repetition, mourning, and representation / Elisabeth Bronfen -- Painting the dead : portraiture and necrophilia in Victorian art and poetry / Carol Christ -- Romanticism and the ghost of prostitution : Freud, Maria, and "Alice Fell" / Sarah Webster Goodwin -- Writing as voodoo : sorcery, hysteria, and art / Regina Barreca -- Women in the forbidden zone : war, women, and death / Margaret R. Higonnet -- Euripides' Alcestis : how to die a normal death in Greek tragedy / Charles Segal -- Beheadings / Regina Janes -- "Who kills whores?" "I do," says Jack : race and gender in Victorian London / Sander L. Gilman -- Representing Sati : continuities and discontinuities / Rajeswari Sunder Rajan -- Afterword : Walter Benjamin and the crisis of representation : multiplicity, meaning, and athematic death / Ronald Schleifer.*
650 0	Death in literature $v Congresses.
650 0	Mimesis in literature $v Congresses.
650 0	Women in literature $v Congresses.
650 0	*Literature $x History and criticism $v Congresses.*
700 1	Goodwin, Sarah McKim Webster, $d 1953-
700 1	Bronfen, Elisabeth.
830 0	**Parallax (Baltimore, Md.)**

CORE

020	0801846242
042	pcc
082 04	809/.93354 $2 21
245 00	Death and representation / $c edited by Sarah Webster Goodwin and Elisabeth Bronfen.
260	Baltimore : $b Johns Hopkins University Press, $c c1993.
300	vii, 336 p. : $b ill. ; $c 24 cm.
490 0	Parallax
650 0	Death in literature $v Congresses.
650 0	Mimesis in literature $v Congresses.
650 0	Women in literature $v Congresses.
700 1	Goodwin, Sarah McKim Webster, $d 1953-
700 1	Bronfen, Elisabeth.

What makes this record a Core record?

- *Multiple 020 fields are not included.*
- *There is no note explaining the nature of the publication.*
- *There is no 504 (the 008 would still include the code for a bibliography).*
- *No contents note is included. If the cataloger considered it important, s/he could provide a partial contents note and still code this as a Core record.*
- *Subject analysis covers primary topics only.*
- *The series has been coded 490 0. This could be done if there were no national series authority record and the cataloger chose not to establish or trace the series. If there were already a series authority record, the cataloger would be required to follow the form and tracing practice on the bibliographic record and would record it as it has been recorded in the Full record.*

Books Format

FULL

020	0271013133 (cloth)
020	*0271013141 (pbk.)*
041 1	*eng $h fre*
042	pcc
043	*mm----- $a e------ $a n-us---* *(043 is not required in a Full record)*
050 4	BL238 $b .K4613 1994
100 1	Kepel, Gilles.
240 10	Revanche de Dieu. $l English
245 14	The revenge of God : $b the resurgence of Islam, Christianity, and Judaism in the modern world / $c Gilles Kepel ; translated by Alan Braley.
260	University Park, Pa. : $b Pennsylvania State University Press, $c 1994.
300	215 p. ; $c 24 cm.
504	*Includes bibliographical references and index.*
650 0	Religious fundamentalism $x History.
650 0	*Islam $z Mediterranean Region $x History $y 20th century.*
610 20	*Catholic Church $z Europe $x History $y 1965-*
650 0	*Protestant churches $z United States $x History $y 20th century.*
650 0	*Judaism $y 20th century.*
651 0	*Europe $x Church history $y 20th century.*
651 0	*Mediterranean Region $x Religion.*
700 1	*Braley, Alan.*

CORE

020	0271013133
042	pcc
050 4	BL238 $b .K4613 1994
100 1	Kepel, Gilles.
240 10	Revanche de Dieu. $l English
245 14	The revenge of God : $b the resurgence of Islam, Christianity, and Judaism in the modern world / $c Gilles Kepel ; translated by Alan Braley.
260	University Park, Pa. : $b Pennsylvania State University Press, $c 1994.
300	215 p. ; $c 24 cm.
650 0	Religious fundamentalism $x History.

What makes this record a Core record?

- *Multiple 020 fields are not included.*
- *041 field is not required.*
- *There is no 504 (the 008 would still include the code for a bibliography and index).*
- *Subject analysis covers primary topics only.*
- *Added entry for translator is not included.*

The uniform title is included in this Core record because it is readily identifiable from the publication in hand.

FULL

020	0820314854	
042	pcc	
043	*n-us---*	*(043 is not required for Full records)*
050 4	PS316 $b .O43 1993	
100 1	Olney, James.	
245 14	The language(s) of poetry : $b Walt Whitman, Emily Dickinson, Gerard Manley Hopkins / $c James Olney.	
246 3	*Language of poetry*	
246 3	*Languages of poetry*	
260	Athens : $b University of Georgia Press, $c c1993.	
300	xiv, 158 p. ; $c 23 cm.	
440 0	Jack N. and Addie D. Averitt lecture series ; $v no. 2	
504	*Includes bibliographical references (p. [151]-153) and index.*	
650 0	American poetry $y 19th century $x History and criticism.	
600 10	Whitman, Walt, $d 1819-1892 $x Criticism and interpretation.	
600 10	Dickinson, Emily, $d 1830-1886 $x Criticism and interpretation.	
600 10	Hopkins, Gerard Manley, $d 1844-1889 $x Criticism and interpretation.	

CORE

020	0820314854
042	pcc
050 4	PS316 $b .O43 1993
100 1	Olney, James.
245 14	The language(s) of poetry : $b Walt Whitman, Emily Dickinson, Gerard Manley Hopkins / $c James Olney.
260	Athens : $b University of Georgia Press, $c c1993.
300	xiv, 158 p. ; $c 23 cm.
440 0	Jack N. and Addie D. Averitt lecture series ; $v no. 2
650 0	American poetry $y 19th century $x History and criticism.
600 10	Whitman, Walt, $d 1819-1892 $x Criticism and interpretation.
600 10	Dickinson, Emily, $d 1830-1886 $x Criticism and interpretation.
600 10	Hopkins, Gerard Manley, $d 1844-1889 $x Criticism and interpretation.

What makes this record a Core record?

- *There are no alternate title fields.*
- *There is no 504 (the 008 would still include the code for a bibliography and index).*

Books Format

FULL

020	0918006325 *: $c $18.00 (ARL members), $25.00 (nonmembers)*
042	pcc
043	*n-us--- $a n-cn---*
050 4	Z682.4.S94 $b D67 1998
100 1	Dorrian, Jean M.
245 10	Educational background of systems librarians / $c Jean M. Dorrian ; edited by Laura A. Rounds.
260	Washington, DC : $b Association of Research Libraries, Office of Leadership and Management Services, $c c1998.
300	49 p. : $b ill. ; $c 28 cm.
440 0	OLMS occasional paper ; $v #20
500	*"April 1998."*
504	*Includes bibliographical references (p. 47-49).*
650 0	Systems librarians $x Education $z United States.
650 0	Systems librarians $x Education $z Canada.
700 1	Rounds, Laura.
710 2	*Association of Research Libraries. $b Office of Leadership and Management Services.*

SACO subject and classification proposals were needed to support this bibliographic record; see example SAP-6 in SACO section and LCCP-3 in Classification Proposal section.

CORE

020	0918006325
042	pcc
050 4	Z682.4.S94 $b D67 1998
100 1	Dorrian, Jean M.
245 10	Educational background of systems librarians / $c Jean M. Dorrian ; edited by Laura A. Rounds.
260	Washington, DC : $b Association of Research Libraries, Office of Leadership and Management Services, $c c1998.
300	49 p. : $b ill. ; $c 28 cm.
440 0	OLMS occasional paper ; $v #20
650 0	Systems librarians $x Education $z United States.
650 0	Systems librarians $x Education $z Canada.
700 1	Rounds, Laura.

SACO subject and classification proposals were needed to support this bibliographic record; see example SAP-6 in SACO section and LCCP-3 in Classification Proposal section. SACO and classification proposals are required for Core records, as well as Full.

What makes this record a Core record?

- *The subfield $c of the 020 is not included.*
- *The 500 note relating to the printing information is not included.*
- *There is no 504 (the 008 would still include the code for a bibliography).*
- *An added entry for the publisher was not considered essential by the cataloger.*

Books Format

FULL

042	pcc
050 0	***GA101 $b .C34 vol. 35, no. 1-2*** ***(multiple 050s are optional)***
050 4	GA102.3 $b .F73 1999
100 1	Fremlin, Gerald.
245 10	Maps as mediated seeing / $c Gerald Fremlin with Arthur H. Robinson.
260	North York, ON : $b University of Toronto Press, $c c1999.
300	141 p. : $b ill. ; $c 28 cm.
490 1	Cartographica, $x 0317-7173 ; $v v. 35, no. 1/2 (spring & summer 1998) = monograph 51
500	***"Published May, 1999."***
504	***Includes bibliographical references (p. 135-137) and index.***
505 0	***Nine short essays about maps -- What is it that is represented on a topographical map? -- The relationship of topography to landscape -- What kind of thing is a map? : not a globe, maybe a picture -- A close relative of maps : letter-rack trompe-l'oeil -- The imagery of topographical maps -- Relief representation -- Process as the subject of thematic maps -- Relationships of thematic map signage to the topographical base -- The case for thematic maps as mediated seeing -- Kinds of thematic map -- Pictures and other non-map graphics combined with maps -- Four short essays on subjects relevant to maps.***
650 0	Maps.
650 0	***Topographic maps.***
650 0	***Thematic maps.***
700 1	Robinson, Arthur Howard, $d 1915-
830 0	Cartographica (1980) ; $v v. 35, no. 1-2.

SACO subject proposal was made for Thematic maps (example not shown in SACO section).

CORE

042	pcc
050 4	GA102.3 $b .F73 1999
100 1	Fremlin, Gerald.
245 10	Maps as mediated seeing / $c Gerald Fremlin with Arthur H. Robinson.
260	North York, ON : $b University of Toronto Press, $c c1999.
300	141 p. : $b ill. ; $c 28 cm.
490 1	Cartographica, $x 0317-7173 ; $v v. 35, no. 1/2 (spring & summer 1998) = monograph 51
650 0	Maps.
700 1	Robinson, Arthur Howard, $d 1915-
830 0	Cartographica (1980) ; $v v. 35, no. 1-2.

What makes this record a Core record?

- *Only one classification number is required on a Core record for books.*
- *There is no note giving printing information.*
- *There is no 504 (the 008 would still include the code for a bibliography and index).*
- *No contents note is included.*
- *The subject analysis covers only the primary topics.*

The classification provided is for the individual title, even though the series authority record (shonw below) indicates that the series is classified together. BIBCO libraries are required to follow the form and tracing practice of series in the national authority file but may deviate on classification decisions.

005	19990708053453.5
050	GA101 $b .C34
130 0	Cartographica (1980)
530 0	Cartographica $w a
641	For issues that are also numbered "monograph", give both numberings in the series statement, e.g. v. 34, no. 3 = monograph 50, but use only authorized form of numbering in series added entry
642	v. 17, no. 4 $5 DPCC $5 DLC
643	Downsview, Ont., Canada $b B.V. Gutsell $b University of Toronto Press
644	f $d analyzable parts $5 DLC $5 WaU
645	t $5 DPCC $5 DLC
646	**c $5 DLC $5 WaU**
667	Only items also numbered "monograph" are to be analyzed
670	Blakemore, M.J. Concepts in the history ... c1980: $b t.p.

Computer Files Format

FULL

RLIN:

007	MDF (COM:c)
	SMD:j CLO:c DME:a SN:_ IBT:??? :FFM:? QAT:? ASO:? LCM:? RQ:?

OCLC:

007	c $b j $d c $e a
020	0135520762
042	pcc
050 4	*HF5694 $b .H36 1996*
100 1	Handa, Puneet.
245 10	FinCoach $h [computer file] : $b financial management math practice program / $c developed by Puneet Handa.
246 30	Financial management math practice program
250	Version A.
256	*Computer data and programs.*
260	Upper Saddle River, NJ : $b Prentice Hall, $c c1996.
300	4 computer disks : $b col. ; $c 3 1/2 in.
516	*Windows-based, self-directed learning program*
538	System requirements: IBM PC or compatible computer; 4 MB of RAM; 6 MB of hard disk space; 386 or better; VGA 256 colors or better; Windows 3.1, Windows for Workgroups 3.11, or Windows 95; Adobe Acrobat Reader (Version 2.0 supplied on disk 4).
500	Title from setup disk label.
521 8	*Geared toward learning material covered primarily in the core finance course at both the undergraduate and MBA levels.*
520	A step-by-step guide to solving corporate finance mathematics problems. Includes a built-in financial calculator and over 5 million practice problems and self-tests in corporate finance and financial management.
650 0	Business mathematics $v Problems, exercises, etc. $v Software.
650 0	Corporations $x Finance $v Problems, exercises, etc. $v Software.
710 2	*Prentice-Hall, inc.*

CORE

RLIN:

007	MDF (COM:c)
	SMD:j CLO:c DME:a SN:_ IBT:??? :FFM:? QAT:? ASO:? LCM:? RQ:?

OCLC:

007	c $b j $d c $e a
020	0135520762
042	pcc
100 1	Handa, Puneet.
245 10	FinCoach $h [computer file] : $b financial management math practice program / $c developed by Puneet Handa.
246 30	Financial management math practice program
250	Version A.
260	Upper Saddle River, NJ : $b Prentice Hall, $c c1996.
300	4 computer disks : $b col. ; $c 3 1/2 in.
538	System requirements: IBM PC or compatible computer; 4 MB of RAM; 6 MB of hard disk space; 386 or better; VGA 256 colors or better; Windows 3.1, Windows for Workgroups 3.11, or Windows 95; Adobe Acrobat Reader (Version 2.0 supplied on disk 4).
500	Title from setup disk label.
520	A step-by-step guide to solving corporate finance mathematics problems. Includes a built-in financial calculator and over 5 million practice problems and self-tests in corporate finance and financial management.
650 0	Business mathematics $v Problems, exercises, etc. $v Software.
650 0	Corporations $x Finance $v Problems, exercises, etc. $v Software.

What makes this record a Core record?

- *Classification is not required for the computer files format.*
- *256, 516, and 521 fields are not required. Note that the 538 field is required for both Full and Core records in this format.*
- *An added entry for the publisher was not considered essential by the cataloger.*

Computer Files Format

FULL

006	m_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ d _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _
RLIN:	
007	MDF (COM:c)
	SMD:o CLO:c DME:g SN:_ IBT:??? :FFM:? QAT:? ASO:? LCM:? RQ:?
OCLC:	
007	c $b o $d c $e g
020	0444827862
042	pcc
060 4	*W 26.5 $b M489i 1997*
111 2	MEDNET 96 $d (1996 : $c Brighton, England)
245 14	The Internet in medicine $h [computer file] / $c edited by Theodorus [sic] N. Arvan[i]tis.
246 1	*$i HTML title screen source title: $a MEDNET 96 CD-ROM proceedings*
246 1	*$i Title on container back insert: $a Proceedings of the European Congress of the Internet in Medicine, 1996, Brighton, UK*
246 1	*$i Title on p. 4 of booklet: $a Internet in medicine CD-ROM proceedings*
256	*Computer data.*
260	Amsterdam ; $a New York : $b Excerpta Medica : $b Elsevier Science, $c c1997.
300	1 computer optical disc : $b col. ; $c 4 3/4 in. + $e 1 booklet (16 p. ; 12 cm.).
490 1	Excerpta Medica international congress series ; $v 1138
500	*Conference proceedings.*
516	*Text (HTML)*
538	System requirements: IBM-compatible PC 386-33 or better; Windows 3.1, 3.11, or Windows 95; 4 MB RAM; 3 MB free hard disk space; 256 color VGA adapter; double speed CD-ROM drive; mouse; HTML browser.
500	Title from title screen.
500	*"MEDNET 96, the European Congress of the Internet in Medicine, October 14-17, 1996, Brighton, United Kingdom"--Welcome screen.*
530	*Abstracts and texts of some papers also available on the MEDNET 96 World Wide Web home page.*
504	*Includes bibliographical references and indexes.*
505 2	*Digital medical libraries -- Electronic publishing in medicine -- Medical education -- Telemedicine -- Information policies and ethical issues -- Internet security -- Access to health and medical information -- Clinical applications on the World Wide Web.*
650 12	Medical Informatics Applications $v congresses - CD-ROM.
650 12	Computer Communication Networks $v congresses - CD-ROM.
650 12	Online Systems $v congresses - CD-ROM.
650 12	Information Systems $v congresses - CD-ROM.
650 22	*Telemedicine $v congresses - CD-ROM.*
650 22	*Databases $v congresses - CD-ROM.*
700 1	Arvanitis, Theodoros N.
710 2	*Excerpta Medica (Firm)*
710 2	*Elsevier Science (Firm)*
830 0	International congress series ; $v no. 1138.
856 42	$u http://www.mednet.org.uk/mednet/mednet96.htm $z Connect to MEDNET 96 home page

CORE

006	m_ _ _ _ _ _ _ d _ _ _ _ _ _ _

RLIN:

007	MDF (COM:c)
	SMD:o CLO:c DME:g SN:_ IBT:??? :FFM:? QAT:? ASO:? LCM:? RQ:?

OCLC:

007	c $b o $d c $e g
020	0444827862
042	pcc
111 2	MEDNET 96 $d (1996 : $c Brighton, England)
245 14	The Internet in medicine $h [computer file] / $c edited by Theodorus [sic] N. Arvan[i]tis.
260	Amsterdam ; $a New York : $b Excerpta Medica : $b Elsevier Science, $c c1997.
300	1 computer optical disc : $b col. ; $c 4 3/4 in. + $e 1 booklet (16 p. ; 12 cm.).
490 1	Excerpta Medica international congress series ; $v 1138
538	System requirements: IBM-compatible PC 386-33 or better; Windows 3.1, 3.11, or Windows 95; 4 MB RAM; 3 MB free hard disk space; 256 color VGA adapter; double speed CD-ROM drive; mouse; HTML browser.
500	Title from title screen.
650 12	Medical Informatics Applications $v congresses - CD-ROM.
650 12	Computer Communication Networks $v congresses - CD-ROM.
650 12	Online Systems $v congresses - CD-ROM.
650 12	Information Systems $v congresses - CD-ROM.
700 1	Arvanitis, Theodoros N.
830 0	International congress series ; $v no. 1138.
856 42	$u http://www.mednet.org.uk/mednet/mednet96.htm $z Connect to MEDNET 96 home page

What makes this record a Core record?

- *Classification is not required for this format.*
- *Alternate title fields are not included.*
- *256, 516 and 530 are not required.*
- *There is no 504 (the 008 would still include the code for a bibliography and index).*
- *The contents note is not required in this case.*

A BIBCO library that classified using Library of Congress classification and that used LC Subject Headings, could add both the classification number and the LC subject headings as an enrichment to this Core record without having to otherwise upgrade it to Full.

Computer Files Format

FULL

006   m _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ d _ i _ _ _ _ _ _

RLIN:
007   MDF (COM:c)
           SMD:r CLO:m DME:n SN:_ IBT:??? :FFM:? QAT:? ASO:? LCM:? RQ:?

OCLC:
007   c $b r $d m $e n

041 0   *engfrespa*
042   pcc
050 4   *TX353 $b .F66 1996*
245 00   Food for all $h [computer file].
246 15   *Nourriture pour tous*
246 15   *Alimentos para todos*
256   *Computer data.*
260   Rome, Italy : $b FAO, $c c1996.
516   *Text (HTML and PDF formats)*
538   *System requirements: Adobe Acrobat Reader.*
538   Mode of access: World Wide Web.
546   *English, French, and Spanish.*
500   Title from Web page (viewed on Oct. 12, 1998).
500   *Published on the occasion of the World Food Summit, 13-17 November 1996 and sponsored by the European Commission.*
505 0   *What is food security? -- How many people, how much food? -- Access to food : escaping the poverty trap -- The resources for food production -- Making better use of what we have -- Basis for a new agricultural revolution -- People in food production -- Ensuring the stability of food supplies -- Changing world trade -- Investing in agriculture and food production -- Defeating hunger : a new commitment, an attainable goal -- Food, a human right : introduction / by Jacques Diouf.*
650 0   Food supply.
650 0   Food relief.
650 0   Agricultural productivity.
710 2   Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
711 2   World Food Summit $d (1996 : $c Rome, Italy)
710 2   European Commission.
856 40 $u http://www.fao.org/wfs/wfsbook/E/FFA01-e.htm
856 40   *$3 French version $u http://www.fao.org/wfs/wfsbook/F/FFA01-f.htm*
856 40   *$3 Spanish version $u http://www.fao.org/wfs/wfsbook/S/FFA01-s.htm*

CORE

006   m _ _ _ _ _ _ _ d _ i _ _ _ _ _ _

RLIN:
007   MDF (COM:c)
               SMD:r CLO:m DME:n SN:_ IBT:??? :FFM:? QAT:? ASO:? LCM:? RQ:?

OCLC:
007   c $b r $d m $e n

042   pcc
245 00   Food for all $h [computer file].
260   Rome, Italy : $b FAO, $c c1996.
538   Mode of access: World Wide Web.
500   Title from Web page (viewed on Oct. 12, 1998).
650 0   Food supply.
650 0   Food relief.
650 0   Agricultural productivity.
710 2   Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
711 2   World Food Summit $d (1996 : $c Rome, Italy)
710 2   European Commission.
856 40 $u http://www.fao.org/wfs/wfsbook/E/FFA01-e.htm

What makes this record a Core record?

- *041 and 546 are not required.*
- *Classification is not required for this format.*
- *Alternate title fields are not included.*
- *256, 516, and 538 are not included.*
- *Contents note is not required in this case.*
- *Alternate URLs for different language versions of the Web site are not required.*

Computer Files Format

FULL

006   m_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ d _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

RLIN:
007   MDF (COM:c)
                   SMD:r CLO:m DME:n SN:_ IBT:??? :FFM:? QAT:? ASO:? LCM:? RQ:?

OCLC:
007   c $b r $d m $e n

042   pcc
050 4   *QL598.5 $b .W67*
245 00   World checklist of extant Mecoptera species $h [computer file].
256   *Computer data.*
260   [San Francisco : $b California Academy of Sciences, $c 1997?-
538   Mode of access: World Wide Web.
500   Title from Web page (viewed on Feb. 22, 1999).
500   *"Content for these pages were provided by: Dr. Norman D. Penny. Images and slides were produced by: Dr. Edward S. Ross, Dr. D.D. Wilder, W. Bicha. Web pages were developed by: Dr. Norman D. Penny, Ms. Julieta F. Parinas"--Copyrights and acknowledgments page.*
504   *Includes bibliographical references.*
650 0   Mecoptera $v Classification.
650 0   Mecoptera $v Nomenclature.
700 1   Penny, Norman D.
700 1   *Parinas, Julieta F.*
710 2   *California Academy of Sciences.*
856 40 $u http://www.calacademy.org/research/entomology/mecoptera/

CORE

006   m_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ d _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

RLIN:
007   MDF (COM:c)
                    SMD:r CLO:m DME:n SN:_ IBT:??? :FFM:? QAT:? ASO:? LCM:? RQ:?

OCLC:
007   c $b r $d m $e n

042   pcc
245 00   World checklist of extant Mecoptera species $h [computer file].
260   [San Francisco : $b California Academy of Sciences, $c 1997?-
538   Mode of access: World Wide Web.
500   Title from Web page (viewed on Feb. 22, 1999).
650 0   Mecoptera $v Classification.
650 0   Mecoptera $v Nomenclature.
700 1   Penny, Norman D.
856 40 $u http://www.calacademy.org/research/entomology/mecoptera/

What makes this record a Core record?

- *Classification number is not required.*
- *256 is not required.*
- *A 500 note detailing the various contributions to the content is not included.*
- *Several added entries were not considered essential by the cataloger.*